

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

WILLIE THOMAS GOSIER,

Plaintiff,

v.

6:23-cv-01118
(DNH/TWD)

ONEIDA COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S
OFFICE, et al.,

Defendants.

APPEARANCES:

WILLIE THOMAS GOSIER

Plaintiff, pro se

24067

Oneida County Correctional Facility

6075 Judd Road

Oriskany, NY 13424

THÉRÈSE WILEY DANCKS, United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER AND REPORT-RECOMMENDATION

The Clerk has sent to the Court for review a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed by Willie Thomas Gosier (“Plaintiff”) pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the Oneida County District Attorney’s Office and District Attorneys Scott D. McNamara, Grant Garramone, and Todd Carville (together, “Defendants”).¹ (Dkt. No. 1.) Plaintiff, who is presently confined at the

¹ The Court takes judicial notice Scott D. McNamara, Esq., is the Oneida County District Attorney; Grant Garramone, Esq., is the Chief Assistant District Attorney; and Todd Carville, Esq., is the Executive Administrative Assistant District Attorney. For ease of reference, the Court refers to the individual Defendants collectively as the “District Attorneys” throughout the decision.

Oneida County Correctional Facility, seeks leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). (Dkt. No. 4.)

I. IFP APPLICATION²

“28 U.S.C. § 1915 permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in a federal court without prepayment of the filing fee that would ordinarily be charged.” *Cash v. Bernstein*, No. 09-CV-1922, 2010 WL 5185047, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 26, 2010).³ “Although an indigent, incarcerated individual need not prepay the filing fee at the time of filing, he must subsequently pay the fee, to the extent he is able to do so, through periodic withdrawals from his inmate accounts.” *Id.* (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b) and *Harris v. City of New York*, 607 F.3d 18, 21 (2d Cir. 2010)).

Upon review of Plaintiff’s IFP application, the Court finds he has demonstrated sufficient economic need. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2). Plaintiff has also filed the inmate authorization form required in this District. (Dkt. No. 5.) Accordingly, the Court grants Plaintiff’s IFP application.⁴ (Dkt. No. 4.)

² On September 5, 2023, Plaintiff’s first IFP application was denied and this action was administratively closed. (Dkt. No. 3.) The case was reopened on September 18, 2023, upon receipt of the required filing. (Dkt. Nos. 4, 5, and 6.)

³ Section 1915(g) prohibits a prisoner from proceeding IFP where, absent a showing of “imminent danger of serious physical injury,” a prisoner has filed three or more actions that were subsequently dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or failing to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s litigation history on the Federal Judiciary’s Public Access to Court Electronic Records (“PACER”) Service. *See* <http://pacer.uspci.uscourts.gov>. It does not appear from that review Plaintiff had accumulated three strikes for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) as of the date this action was commenced.

⁴ Plaintiff is advised that although he has been granted IFP status, he is still required to pay any fees and costs he may incur in this action.

II. SUFFICIENCY OF THE COMPLAINT

A. Standard of Review

Having found Plaintiff meets the financial criteria for commencing this action IFP, and because Plaintiff seeks relief from an officer or employee of a governmental entity, the Court must consider the sufficiency of the allegations set forth in the complaint in light of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e) and 1915A. Section 1915(e) of Title 28 of the United States Code directs that, when a plaintiff seeks to proceed in forma pauperis, “the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that – . . . (B) the action . . . (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).⁵

Similarly, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, a court must review any “complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity” and must “identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint . . . is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or . . . seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b); *see also Carr v. Dvorin*, 171 F.3d 115, 116 (2d Cir. 1999) (per curiam) (noting Section 1915A applies to all actions brought by prisoners against government officials even when plaintiff paid the filing fee). The term “prisoner” includes pretrial detainees. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(c) (2006).

Additionally, when reviewing a complaint, the Court looks to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a pleading which sets

⁵ To determine whether an action is frivolous, a court must look to see whether the complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

forth a claim for relief shall contain, *inter alia*, “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). The purpose of Rule 8 “is to give fair notice of the claim being asserted so as to permit the adverse party the opportunity to file a responsive answer, prepare an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of res judicata is applicable.” *Hudson v. Artuz*, No. 95 Civ. 4768, 1998 WL 832708, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 30, 1998) (quoting *Powell v. Marine Midland Bank*, No. 95-CV-0063 (TJM), 162 F.R.D. 15, 16 (N.D.N.Y. June 23, 1995)) (other citations omitted).

A court should not dismiss a complaint if the plaintiff has stated “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). While the court should construe the factual allegations in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, “the tenet that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions.” *Id.* “Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Id.* (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555). Rule 8 “demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Id.* Thus, a pleading that contains only allegations which “are so vague as to fail to give the defendants adequate notice of the claims against them” is subject to dismissal. *Sheehy v. Brown*, 335 F. App’x 102, 104 (2d Cir. 2009).

The Court will construe the allegations in the complaint with the utmost leniency. *See, e.g., Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972) (holding a *pro se* litigant’s complaint is to be held “to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers”).

B. Summary of Complaint

Utilizing a form civil rights complaint, Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated his Fourteenth Amendment right by using “deliberately fabricated evidence” to “build a case” and “frame” him for second degree criminal possession of a weapon and “other” charges. (Dkt. No. 1 at 5-7, 9.) Plaintiff claims the District Attorneys “continued prosecuting [him] despite the fact they knew [he] was innocent.” *Id.* at 9. They also “worked with” and “pressured” Utica Police Department officers and investigators to use “extremely aggressive interview techniques when questioning witnesses, thus generating a false statement and false evidence against [him].” *Id.* Defendants “knew or should have known” the “investigative techniques” were “so coercive and abusive” it “would yield false information, misconduct, and fabricated evidence.” *Id.*

As relief, Plaintiff seeks monetary relief from all Defendants in the amount of \$550,000 and “dismissal” of “charges filed against him” including the second degree criminal possession of a weapon charge. *Id.* at 4, 11. He also asks, “for a full investigation into police misconduct at Utica Police Department.” *Id.* at 4.

III. ANALYSIS

Plaintiff seeks relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which establishes a cause of action for “the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws’ of the United States.” *Wilder v. Virginia Hosp. Ass’n*, 496 U.S. 498, 508 (1990) (citations omitted); *see also Myers v. Wollowitz*, No. 95-CV-0272, 1995 WL 236245, at *2 (N.D.N.Y. Apr. 10, 1995) (finding that “§ 1983 is the vehicle by which individuals may seek redress for alleged violations of their constitutional rights”). “Section 1983 itself creates no substantive rights, [but] . . . only a procedure for redress for the deprivation of rights established elsewhere.” *Sykes v. James*, 13 F.3d 515, 519 (2d Cir. 1993). “To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege

that defendants violated plaintiff's federal rights while acting under color of state law."

McGugan v. Aldana-Bernier, 752 F.3d 224, 229 (2d Cir. 2014) (citations omitted).

A. Oneida County District Attorney's Office

New York State is immune from suits pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 seeking either legal or equitable relief, under the Eleventh Amendment. *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 276 (1986); *Pennhurst State School & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 98-100 (1984). Eleventh Amendment immunity extends to local governments and to a district attorney's office exercising its prosecutorial functions. *See, e.g., Altman v. Nassau Cty. Dist. Attorney's Off.*, No. 22-CV-0987, 2022 WL 767654, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 14, 2022) ("Defendant Nassau County District Attorney's Office . . . is immune from suit."); *Baskerville v. Richmond Cty.*, No. 19-CV-2 (AMD), 2019 WL 2162595, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. May 16, 2019) (holding the "plaintiff's claims against the Office of the Richmond County District Attorney concern[ed] its prosecution of the plaintiff" and thus that "the plaintiff's claims [were] barred by the Eleventh Amendment"); *White v. Vance*, No. 10-CV-6142 (NRB), 2011 WL 2565476, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. June 21, 2011) ("[B]ecause plaintiff asserts claims for monetary relief, any claims against the [New York County District Attorney's] Office are also barred by the Eleventh Amendment.").

Accordingly, the Court recommends Plaintiff's Section 1983 claim against the Oneida County District Attorney's Office be dismissed.

B. District Attorneys

Prosecutors enjoy "absolute immunity from § 1983 liability for those prosecutorial activities intimately associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process." *Barr v. Abrams*, 810 F.2d 358, 361 (2d Cir. 1987). The immunity covers "virtually all acts, regardless of motivation, associated with [the prosecutor's] function as an advocate." *Hill v. City of New*

York, 45 F.3d 653, 661 (2d Cir. 1995). Absolute immunity applies when a prosecutor’s conduct, acting as an advocate during the judicial phase of the criminal process, involves the exercise of discretion. *See Flagler v. Trainor*, 663 F.3d 543, 547 (2d Cir. 2011). This includes such functions as “deciding whether to bring charges and presenting a case to a grand jury or a court, along with the tasks generally considered adjunct to those functions, such as witness preparation, witness selection, and issuing subpoenas,” *Simon v. City of New York*, 727 F.3d 167, 171 (2d Cir. 2013), and whether and when to drop charges. *Taylor v. Kavanagh*, 640 F.2d 450, 452 (2d Cir. 1981). “This immunity attaches to conduct in court, as well as conduct ‘preliminary to the initiation of a prosecution and actions apart from the courtroom.’” *Giraldo v. Kessler*, 694 F.3d 161, 165 (2d Cir. 2012) (quoting *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 431 n.33 (1976)).

“[O]nce a court determines that challenged conduct involves a function covered by absolute immunity, the actor is shielded from liability for damages regardless of the wrongfulness of his motive or the degree of injury caused.” *Bernard v. Cty. of Suffolk*, 356 F.3d 495, 503 (2d Cir. 2004) (citing *Cleavinger v. Saxner*, 474 U.S. 193, 199-200 (1985)). Absolute immunity extends even to a prosecutor who “conspir[es] to present false evidence at a criminal trial. The fact that such a conspiracy is certainly not something that is properly within the role of a prosecutor is immaterial, because the immunity attaches to his function, not to the manner in which he performed it.” *Dory v. Ryan*, 25 F.3d 81, 83 (2d Cir. 1994) (cleaned up). Immunity even extends to “the falsification of evidence and the coercion of witnesses,” *Taylor*, 640 F.2d at 452, “the knowing use of perjured testimony,” “the deliberate withholding of exculpatory information,” *Imbler*, 424 U.S. at 431 n.34, the “making [of] false or defamatory statements in judicial proceedings,” *Burns v. Reed*, 500 U.S. 478, 490 (1991), and “conspiring to present false evidence at a criminal trial,” *Dory*, 25 F.3d at 83.

Here, Plaintiff’s Section 1983 claim against the District Attorneys for “fabricated evidence” emanates from their alleged conduct in prosecuting Plaintiff for second degree criminal possession of a weapon and “other” charges. (Dkt. No. 1 at 9-10.) Therefore, they are entitled to prosecutorial immunity. *Simon*, 727 F.3d at 171; *see, e.g., Matthews v. Cty. of Cayuga*, No. 5:17-CV-1004 (MAD/TWD), 2018 WL 2926272, at *3 (N.D.N.Y. June 8, 2018) (dismissing claims against prosecutor on initial review because of prosecutorial immunity).

Moreover, “[w]hen prosecuting a criminal matter, a district attorney in New York State, acting in a quasi-judicial capacity, represents the State not the county.” *Ying Jing Gan v. City of New York*, 996 F.2d 522, 536 (2d Cir. 1993) (quoting *Baez v. Hennessy*, 853 F.2d 73, 77 (2d Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 488 U.S. 1014 (1989)); *see also Rich v. New York*, No. 21-CV-3835, 2022 WL 992885, at *5 n.4 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2022) (“[A]ny claims Plaintiff may raise against the [District Attorney] Defendants in their ‘official capacity’ would be precluded by immunity under the Eleventh Amendment.”); *Gentry v. New York*, No. 21-CV-0319 (GTS/ML), 2021 WL 3037709, at *6 (N.D.N.Y. June 14, 2021) (recommending dismissal of the plaintiff’s claims against the defendant assistant district attorneys in their official capacities—which were effectively claims against the State of New York—as barred by the Eleventh Amendment), *adopted by*, 2021 WL 3032691 (N.D.N.Y. July 19, 2021).

Therefore, the Court recommends Plaintiff’s Section 1983 claims against the District Attorneys be dismissed.

IV. LEAVE TO AMEND

Ordinarily, a court “should not dismiss” a *pro se* complaint “without granting leave to amend at least once when a liberal reading of the complaint gives any indication that a valid claim might be stated.” *Gomez v. USAA Fed. Sav. Bank*, 171 F.3d 794, 795–96 (2d Cir. 1999)

(quoting *Branum v. Clark*, 927 F.2d 698, 705 (2d Cir. 1991)); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2) (“The court should freely give leave when justice so requires.”). An opportunity to amend is not required, however, where “the problem with [the plaintiff’s] causes of action is substantive” such that “better pleading will not cure it.” *Cuoco v. Moritsugu*, 222 F.3d 99, 112 (2d Cir. 2000). Stated differently, “[w]here it appears that granting leave to amend is unlikely to be productive, . . . it is not an abuse of discretion to deny leave to amend.” *Ruffolo v. Oppenheimer & Co.*, 987 F.2d 129, 131 (2d Cir. 1993).

Here, because Plaintiff’s Section 1983 against Defendants are barred under the doctrines of Eleventh Amendment immunity and prosecutorial immunity, leave to amend would be futile. Therefore, the Court recommends the complaint be dismissed without leave to amend.

V. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is hereby,

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s IFP application (Dkt. No. 4) is **GRANTED**, and it is further **RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiff’s complaint (Dkt. No. 1) be **DISMISSED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this Order and Report-Recommendation on Plaintiff, along with a copy of the unpublished decisions cited herein in accordance with the Second Circuit’s decision in *Lebron v. Sanders*, 557 F.3d 76 (2d Cir. 2009) (per curiam).


Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties have fourteen days within which to file written objections to the foregoing report.⁶ Such objections shall be filed with the Clerk of the

⁶ If you are proceeding *pro se* and are served with this Order and Report-Recommendation by mail, three additional days will be added to the fourteen-day period, meaning that you have seventeen days from the date the Order and Report-Recommendation was mailed to you to serve and file objections. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d). If the last day of that prescribed period falls on a

Court. **FAILURE TO OBJECT TO THIS REPORT WITHIN FOURTEEN DAYS WILL PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW.** *Roldan v. Racette*, 984 F.2d 85 (2d Cir. 1993) (citing *Small v. Sec’y of Health and Human Servs.*, 892 F.2d 15 (2d Cir. 1989)); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, 6(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 18, 2023
Syracuse, New York



Therèse Wiley Dancks
United States Magistrate Judge

Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, then the deadline is extended until the end of the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1)(C).

2010 WL 5185047

2010 WL 5185047

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,
S.D. New York.

David J. CASH, Plaintiff,

v.

BERNSTEIN, MD, Defendant.

No. 09 Civ.1922(BSJ)(HBP).

I

Oct. 26, 2010.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION¹

¹ At the time the action was originally filed, the Honorable Leonard B. Sand, United States District Judge, granted plaintiff's application for *in forma pauperis* status based on plaintiff's *ex parte* submission (Docket Item 1). Although the present application seeking to revoke plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* status is non-dispositive, I address it by way of a report and recommendation to eliminate any appearance of a conflict between the decision of a district judge and that of a magistrate judge.

PITMAN, United States Magistrate Judge.

*1 TO THE HONORABLE BARBARA S. JONES, United States District Judge,

I. Introduction

By notice of motion dated March 4, 2010 (Docket Item 11), defendant moves pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) to revoke plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") status on the ground that plaintiff has previously had at least three Section 1983 actions dismissed as frivolous, malicious or failing to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, and has not shown that he is in imminent danger of serious physical injury. Defendant further seeks an order directing that the action be dismissed unless plaintiff pays the full filing fee within thirty (30) days. For the reasons set forth below, I respectfully recommend that defendant's motion be granted.

II. Facts

Plaintiff, a sentenced inmate in the custody of the New York State Department of Correctional Services, commenced this action on or about January 12, 2009 by submitting his complaint to the Court's Pro Se office. Plaintiff alleges, in pertinent part, that he has "a non-healing ulcer that is gane green [*sic*]" and that defendant Bernstein "did not want to treat the ulcer right" (Complaint, dated March 3, 3009 (Docket Item 2) ("Compl."), at 3).

The action was originally commenced against two defendants—Dr. Bernstein and Dr. Finkelstein. The action was dismissed as to Dr. Finkelstein because the complaint contained no allegations whatsoever concerning Dr. Finkelstein (Order dated February 18, 2010 (Docket Item 9)).

On March 4, 2010, the sole remaining defendant—Dr. Bernstein—filed the current motion. Plaintiff failed to submit a response. Accordingly, on August 20, 2010, I issued an Order advising plaintiff that if he wished to oppose the motion, he must submit his opposition by September 15, 2010 and that after that date I would consider the motion fully submitted and ripe for decision (Order dated August 20, 2010 (Docket Item 15)). The only submission plaintiff has made in response to my Order is a multi-part form issued by the New York State Department of Correctional Services entitled "Disbursement or Refund Request."² By this form, plaintiff appears to request that the New York State Department of Correctional Services pay the filing fee for this action. The form is marked "Denied."

² Plaintiff sent this form directly to my chambers, and it has not been docketed by the Clerk of the Court. The form will be docketed at the time this Report and Recommendation is issued.

III. Analysis

28 U.S.C. § 1915 permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in a federal court without prepayment of the filing fee that would ordinarily be charged. Although an indigent, incarcerated individual need not prepay the filing fee at the time at the time of filing, he must subsequently pay the fee, to the extent he is able to do so, through periodic withdrawals from his inmate accounts. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b); *Harris v. City of New York*, 607 F.3d 18, 21 (2d Cir.2010). To prevent abuse of the judicial system by inmates, paragraph (g) of this provision denies incarcerated individuals the right to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee if they have repeatedly filed meritless actions, unless such an individual shows that he or she is in imminent danger of serious

physical injury. See *Ortiz v. McBride*, 380 F.3d 649, 658 (2d Cir.2004) (“[T]he purpose of the PLRA ... was plainly to curtail what Congress perceived to be inmate abuses of the judicial process.”); *Nicholas v. Tucker*, 114 F.3d 17, 19 (2d Cir.1997). Specifically, paragraph (g) provides:

*2 In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

If an inmate plaintiff seeks to avoid prepayment of the filing fee by alleging imminent danger of serious physical injury, there must be a nexus between the serious physical injury asserted and the claims alleged. *Pettus v. Morgenthau*, 554 F.3d 293, 298 (2d Cir.2009).

Section 1915(g) clearly prevents plaintiff from proceeding in this action without prepayment of the filing fee. The memorandum submitted by defendant establishes that plaintiff has had his IFP status revoked on at least four prior occasions as a result of his repeatedly filing meritless actions.

- In 2005, plaintiff commenced an action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York seeking to have his infected leg amputated. *Nelson*³ v. *Lee*, No. 9:05–CV–1096 (NAM)(DEP), 2007 WL 4333776 (N.D.N.Y. Dec. 5, 2007). In that matter, the Honorable Norman A. Mordue, Chief United States District Judge, accepted and adopted the Report and Recommendation of the Honorable David E. Peebles, United States Magistrate Judge, that plaintiff had brought three or more prior actions that had been dismissed for failure to state a claim and that plaintiff's IFP status should, therefore, be revoked. 2007 WL 4333776 at *1–*2.

3

It appears that plaintiff uses the names David J. Cash and Dennis Nelson interchangeably. In his complaint in this matter, plaintiff states that the Departmental Identification Number, or DIN, assigned to him by the New York State Department of Correctional Services (“DOCS”) is 94–B–0694 (Compl. at 7). DOCS inmate account records submitted by plaintiff in connection with his application for IFP status indicate that DIN 94–B–0694 is assigned to Dennis Nelson. In addition, the DOCS form described in footnote two bears the docket number of this action, but is signed in the name of Dennis Nelson and was sent in an envelope identifying the sender as Dennis Nelson. A subsequent action has been filed in this Court in which the plaintiff identifies himself as Dennis Nelson but lists his DIN as 94–B–0694, the same DIN used by plaintiff here. Finally, plaintiff has submitted nothing to controvert the assertion in defendant's papers that David Cash and Dennis Nelson are the same person. In light of all these facts, I conclude that David Cash and Dennis Nelson are both names used by plaintiff.

- In *Nelson v. Nesmith*, No. 9:06–CV–1177 (TJM)(DEP), 2008 WL 3836387 (N.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2008), plaintiff again filed an action concerning the medical care he was receiving for his left leg. The Honorable Thomas J. McAvoy, United States District Judge, accepted the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Peebles, and revoked plaintiff's IFP status and dismissed the action on the ground that plaintiff had previously commenced at least three actions that had been dismissed on the merits. 2008 WL 3836387 at *1, *7.
- In *Nelson v. Spitzer*, No. 9:07–CV–1241 (TJM) (RFT), 2008 WL 268215 (N.D.N.Y. Jan. 29, 2008), Judge McAvoy again revoked plaintiff's IFP status on the ground that plaintiff had commenced three or more actions that constituted “strikes” under Section 1915(g) and had not shown an imminent threat of serious physical injury. 2008 WL 268215 at *1–*2.
- Finally, in *Nelson v. Chang*, No. 08–CV–1261 (KAM)(LB), 2009 WL 367576 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 10, 2009), the Honorable Kiyo A. Matsumoto, United

States District Judge, also found, based on the cases discussed above, that plaintiff had exhausted the three strikes permitted by [Section 1915\(g\)](#) and could not proceed IFP in the absence of a demonstration of an imminent threat of serious physical injury. 2009 WL 367576 at *2–*3.

*3 As defendant candidly admits, there is one case in which plaintiff's leg infection was found to support a finding of an imminent threat of serious physical injury sufficient to come within the exception to [Section 1915\(g\)](#). *Nelson v. Scoggy*, No. 9:06–CV–1146 (NAM)(DRH), 2008 WL 4401874 at *2 (N.D.N.Y. Sept. 24, 2008). Nevertheless, summary judgment was subsequently granted for defendants in that case, and the complaint was dismissed. Judge Mordue concluded that there was no genuine issue of fact that plaintiff had received adequate medical care for his leg wound and that the failure of the leg to heal was the result of plaintiff's own acts of self-mutilation and interference with the treatment provided. *Nelson v. Scoggy*, No. 9:06–CV–1146 (NAM)(DRH), 2009 WL 5216955 at *3–*4 (N.D.N.Y. Dec. 30, 2009).⁴

⁴ Although the form complaint utilized by plaintiff expressly asks about prior actions involving the same facts, plaintiff disclosed only the *Scoggy* action and expressly denied the existence of any other actions relating to his imprisonment (Compl. at 6).

In light of the foregoing, there can be no reasonable dispute that plaintiff has exceeded the three “strikes” allowed by [Section 1915\(g\)](#) and that he cannot, therefore, proceed here without prepaying the filing fee unless he demonstrates an imminent threat of serious physical injury. Plaintiff has declined to attempt to make this showing in response to defendant's motion, and the only suggestion in the record of serious physical injury is the bare statement in the complaint that plaintiff “need[s] to go back to a wound speci[a]list before the gane green [*sic*] kills [him]” (Compl. at 5). “However, unsupported, vague, self-serving, conclusory speculation is not sufficient to show that Plaintiff is, in fact, in imminent danger of serious physical harm.” *Merriweather v. Reynolds*, 586 F.Supp.2d 548, 552 (D.S.C.2008), citing *Ciarpaglini v. Saini*, 352 F.3d 328, 330 (7th Cir.2003) and *White v. Colorado*, 157 F.3d 1226, 1231–32 (10th Cir.1998); see also *Martin v. Shelton*, 319 F.3d 1048, 1050 (8th Cir.2003) (imminent danger exception to [Section 1915\(g\)](#) requires “specific fact allegations of ongoing serious physical injury, or of a pattern of misconduct evidencing the likelihood of imminent serious physical injury”). Given the plaintiff's

history, as set forth in the cases described above, I conclude that this vague statement is insufficient to support a finding that plaintiff is in imminent danger of serious physical injury.⁵

⁵ Plaintiff has sent me several letters describing his wound and its symptoms in detail, and I have no doubt that the wound is serious. However, in granting summary judgment dismissing an action last year based on the same allegations, Judge Mordue of the Northern District found that there was no genuine issue of fact that plaintiff's own conduct was responsible for the ineffectiveness of the treatment he was provided:

Furthermore, to the extent that Nelson's medical treatment was delayed, much of the delay was due to his own refusal to cooperate with medical staff and his self-mutilations. Nelson's actions to thwart the medical treatment of his wound cannot be construed as interference or indifference by anyone else.... [T]he medical treatment Nelson received complied with constitutional guarantees as it was appropriate, timely, and delayed only by Nelson's own actions.

Nelson v. Scoggy, *supra*, 2009 WL 5216955 at *4.

Given plaintiff's total failure to respond to the pending motion and his failure to even deny that he is actively thwarting treatment of his wound, it would be sheer speculation for me to conclude that he is in imminent danger of a serious injury as a result of defendant's conduct.

IV. Conclusion

Accordingly, for all the foregoing reasons, I find that plaintiff has had three or more prior actions dismissed as being frivolous, malicious or failing to state a claim and that plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* status should, therefore, be revoked. If your Honor accepts this recommendation, I further recommend that the action be dismissed unless plaintiff pays the filing fee in full within thirty (30) days of your Honor's final resolution of this motion.

V. OBJECTIONS

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and [Rule 72\(b\)](#) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the parties shall have fourteen (14) days from receipt of this Report to file written objections. See also [Fed.R.Civ.P. 6\(a\)](#). Such objections (and

responses thereto) shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court, with courtesy copies delivered to the Chambers of the Honorable Barbara S. Jones, United States District Judge, 500 Pearl Street, Room 1920, and to the Chambers of the undersigned, 500 Pearl Street, Room 750, New York, New York 10007. Any requests for an extension of time for filing objections must be directed to Judge Jones. FAILURE TO OBJECT WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS **WILL** RESULT IN A WAIVER OF OBJECTIONS AND **WILL** PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 155

(1985); *United States v. Male Juvenile*, 121 F.3d 34, 38 (2d Cir.1997); *IUE AFL-CIO Pension Fund v. Herrmann*, 9 F.3d 1049, 1054 (2d Cir.1993); *Frank v. Johnson*, 968 F.2d 298, 300 (2d Cir.1992); *Wesolek v. Canadair Ltd.*, 838 F.2d 55, 57–59 (2d Cir.1988); *McCarthy v. Manson*, 714 F.2d 234, 237–38 (2d Cir.1983).

All Citations

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2010 WL 5185047

End of Document

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

1998 WL 832708

1998 WL 832708

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, S.D. New York.

Theodore HUDSON, Plaintiff,

v.

Christopher ARTUZ, Warden Philip

Coombe, Commissioner Sergeant

Ambrosino Doctor Manion Defendants.

No. 95 CIV. 4768(JSR).

|

Nov. 30, 1998.

Attorneys and Law Firms

Mr. Theodore Hudson, Great Meadow Correctional Facility, Comstock.

Alfred A. Delicata, Esq., Assistant Attorney General, New York.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

BUCHWALD, Magistrate J.

*1 Plaintiff Theodore Hudson filed this *pro se* action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on April 26, 1995. Plaintiff's complaint alleges defendants violated his constitutional rights while he was an inmate at Green Haven Correctional Facility.¹ Plaintiff's complaint was dismissed *sua sponte* by Judge Thomas P. Griesa on June 26, 1995 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d). On September 26, 1995, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals vacated the judgment and remanded the case to the district court for further proceedings.

¹ Plaintiff is presently incarcerated at Sullivan Correctional Facility.

The case was reassigned to Judge Barbara S. Jones on January 31, 1996. Defendants moved to dismiss the complaint pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(c) on November 25, 1996. Thereafter, the case was reassigned to Judge Jed S. Rakoff on February 26, 1997. On February 26, 1998, Judge Rakoff granted defendants' motion to dismiss, but vacated the judgment on April 10, 1998 in response to plaintiff's motion for reconsideration in which plaintiff claimed that he never received defendants' motion to dismiss.

By Judge Rakoff's Order dated April 14, 1998, this case was referred to me for general pretrial purposes and for a Report and Recommendation on any dispositive motion. Presently pending is defendants' renewed motion to dismiss. Plaintiff filed a reply on July 6, 1998. For the reasons discussed below, plaintiff's complaint is dismissed without prejudice, and plaintiff is granted leave to replead within thirty (30) days of the date of the entry of this order.

FACTS

Plaintiff alleges that he was assaulted by four inmates in the Green Haven Correctional Facility mess hall on March 14, 1995. (Complaint at 4.) He alleges that he was struck with a pipe and a fork while in the "pop room" between 6:00 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. (Complaint at 4-5.) Plaintiff contends that the attack left him with 11 stitches in his head, chronic headaches, nightmares, and pain in his arm, shoulder, and back. (*Id.*) Plaintiff also states that Sergeant Ambrosino "failed to secure [the] area and separate" him from his attackers. (Reply at 5.) Plaintiff's claim against Warden Artuz is that he "fail [sic] to qualify as warden." (Complaint at 4.) Plaintiff names Commissioner Coombes as a defendant, alleging Coombes "fail [sic] to appoint a qualified warden over security." (Amended Complaint at 5.) Plaintiff further alleges that Dr. Manion refused to give him pain medication. (Complaint at 5.) Plaintiff seeks to "prevent violent crimes" and demands \$6,000,000 in damages. (Amended Complaint at 5.)

Defendants moved to dismiss the complaint, arguing that: (1) the Eleventh Amendment bars suit against state defendants for money damages; (2) the plaintiff's allegations fail to state a claim for a constitutional violation; (3) the defendants are qualifiedly immune from damages; and (4) plaintiff must exhaust his administrative remedies before bringing this suit.

DISCUSSION

I find that plaintiff's complaint runs afoul of Rules 8 and 10 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and dismiss the complaint without prejudice and with leave to amend. Federal Rule 8 requires that a complaint contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2). The purpose of this Rule "is to give fair notice of the claim being asserted so as to permit the

1998 WL 832708

adverse party the opportunity to file a responsive answer [and] prepare an adequate defense.” *Powell v. Marine Midland Bank*, 162 F.R.D. 15, 16 (N.D.N.Y.1995) (quoting *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C.1977)); see *Salahuddin v. Cuomo*, 861 F.2d 40, 42 (2d Cir.1988) (stating that the “principal function of pleadings under the Federal Rules is to give the adverse party fair notice of the claim asserted so as to enable him to answer and prepare for trial”).

*2 Rule 10 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires, *inter alia*, that the allegations in a plaintiff's complaint be made in numbered paragraphs, each of which should recite, as far as practicable, only a single set of circumstances. *Moore's Federal Practice*, Vol. 2A, ¶ 10.03 (1996). Rule 10 also requires that each claim upon which plaintiff seeks relief be founded upon a separate transaction or occurrence. *Id.*² The purpose of Rule 10 is to “provide an easy mode of identification for referring to a particular paragraph in a prior pleading.” *Sandler v. Capanna*, 92 Civ. 4838, 1992 WL 392597, *3 (E.D.Pa. Dec.17, 1992) (citing 5 C. Wright & A. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure*, § 1323 at 735 (1990)).

2 Rule 10 states:

(b) Paragraphs; Separate Statements. All averments of claim or defense shall be made in numbered paragraphs, the contents of each of which shall be limited as far as practicable to a statement of a single set of circumstances; and a paragraph may be referred to by number in all succeeding pleadings. Each claim founded upon a separate transaction or occurrence and each defense other than denials shall be stated in a separate count or defense whenever a separation facilitates the clear presentation of the matters set forth.

A complaint that fails to comply with these pleading rules “presents far too heavy a burden in terms of defendants' duty to shape a comprehensive defense and provides no meaningful basis for the Court to assess the sufficiency of” a plaintiff's claims. *Gonzales v. Wing*, 167 F.R.D. 352, 355 (N.D.N.Y.1996). It may therefore be dismissed by the court. *Id.*; see also *Salahuddin v. Cuomo*, 861 F.2d at 42 (“When a complaint does not comply with the requirement that it be short and plain, the court has the power to, on its own initiative, ... dismiss the complaint”). Dismissal, however, is “usually reserved for those cases in which the complaint is so confused, ambiguous, vague, or otherwise unintelligible

that its true substance, if any, is well disguised.” *Id.* In those cases in which the court dismisses a *pro se* complaint for failure to comply with Rule 8, it should give the plaintiff leave to amend when the complaint states a claim that is on its face nonfrivolous. *Simmons v. Abruzzo*, 49 F.3d 83, 87 (2d Cir.1995).

In determining whether a nonfrivolous claim is stated, the complaint's allegations are taken as true, and the “complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief.” *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45–46, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80 (1957). The complaint of a *pro se* litigant is to be liberally construed in his favor when determining whether he has stated a meritorious claim. See *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520, 92 S.Ct. 594, 30 L.Ed.2d 652 (1972). Even if it is difficult to determine the actual substance of the plaintiff's complaint, outright dismissal without leave to amend the complaint is generally disfavored as an abuse of discretion. See *Salahuddin*, 861 F.2d at 42–42; see also *Doe v. City of New York*, No. 97 Civ. 420, 1997 WL 124214, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. Mar.12, 1997).

Here, plaintiff's *pro se* complaint fails to satisfy the requirements of Federal Rules 8 and 10. The complaint is often illegible and largely incomprehensible, scattering what appear to be allegations specific to plaintiff within a forest of headnotes copied from prior opinions. Defendants have answered with a boilerplate brief, which is perhaps all a defendant can do when faced with such a complaint. The Court is left with an insurmountable burden in attempting to make a reasoned ruling on such muddled pleadings.

*3 Although plaintiff's complaint is substantially incomprehensible, it appears to plead at least some claims that cannot be termed frivolous on their face. For example, plaintiff clearly alleges that inmates assaulted him and that Dr. Manion refused to provide him medical attention. He also appears to assert that Sergeant Ambrosino failed to protect him from the attack or take steps to prevent future attacks. (Plaintiff's Reply at 5). It is well established that an inmate's constitutional rights are violated when prison officials act with deliberate indifference to his safety or with intent to cause him harm. *Hendricks v. Coughlin*, 942 F.2d 109 (2d Cir.1991). It is similarly well established that an inmate's constitutional rights are violated when a prison doctor denies his request for medical care with deliberate indifference to the inmate's serious medical needs. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429

1998 WL 832708

U.S. 97, 97 S.Ct. 285, 50 L.Ed.2d 251 (1976); *Hathaway v. Coughlin*, 37 F.3d 63 (2d Cir.1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 1154, 115 S.Ct. 1108, 130 L.Ed.2d 1074 (1995). Although plaintiff provides few facts to support his allegations, I disagree with defendants' assertion that outright dismissal is appropriate because it "appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." Defendant's Memorandum at 5 (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45–46, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80 (1957)).

Because plaintiff's complaint does not comply with [Rules 8](#) and [10](#), it is hereby dismissed without prejudice, and plaintiff is granted leave to replead within thirty (30) days of the date of the entry of this Order. In drafting his second amended complaint, plaintiff is directed to number each paragraph and order the paragraphs chronologically, so that each incident in which he alleges a constitutional violation is described in the order that it occurred. Plaintiff is also directed to specifically describe the actions of each defendant that caused plaintiff

harm, and to do so in separate paragraphs for each defendant. Plaintiff's complaint shall contain the facts specific to the incidents plaintiff alleges occurred, and not any facts relating to any case that has been decided previously by a court of law. Plaintiff's complaint shall also contain a clear statement of the relief he seeks in addition to monetary damages.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, plaintiff's complaint is dismissed without prejudice, and plaintiff is granted leave to replead within thirty (30) days of the date of the entry of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

All Citations

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 1998 WL 832708

End of Document

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

1995 WL 236245

1995 WL 236245

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.
 United States District Court, N.D. New York.

James N. MYERS, Jr., Plaintiff,

v.

Heather WOLLOWITZ, Attorney, Defendant.

No. 95–CV–0272 (TJM) (RWS).

I

April 10, 1995.

Attorneys and Law Firms

James N. Myers, Jr., Troy, NY, pro se.

DECISION AND ORDER

McAVOY, Chief Judge.

I. Background

*1 Presently before this Court is the above-captioned plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and civil rights complaint. Plaintiff has not paid the partial filing fee required to maintain this action.

For the reasons stated below, plaintiff's complaint is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) and Local Rule 5.4(a) of the General Rules of this Court as without arguable basis in law.

In his *pro se* complaint, plaintiff seems to claim that plaintiff was represented by defendant Wollowitz, a public defender for the County of Rensselaer, in a County Court proceeding. Plaintiff alleges that after a criminal proceeding in that Court, plaintiff was "sentenced to a illegal sentence." *Id.* at 2. Plaintiff contends that due to the ineffective assistance of his counsel, defendant Wollowitz, his constitutional rights were violated. For a more complete statement of plaintiff's claims, reference is made to the entire complaint filed herein.

II. Discussion

Consideration of whether a *pro se* plaintiff should be permitted to proceed in forma pauperis is a two-step process. First, the court must determine whether the plaintiff's economic status warrants waiver of fees and costs under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). If the plaintiff qualifies by economic status, the court must then consider whether the cause of action

stated in the complaint is frivolous or malicious. *Moreman v. Douglas*, 848 F.Supp. 332, 333 (N.D.N.Y.1994) (Scullin, J.); *Potnick v. Eastern State Hosp.*, 701 F.2d 243, 244 (2d Cir.1983) (per curiam).

In the present case, upon review of the plaintiff's inmate account statements, the Court has determined that plaintiff's financial status qualifies him to file or "commence" this action in forma pauperis. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Turning to the second inquiry, a court may "dismiss the proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) if the court thereafter determines that ... the action is frivolous or malicious." *Moreman*, 848 F.Supp. at 333 (citation omitted).

In determining whether an action is frivolous, the court must look to see whether the complaint lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Although the court has the duty to show liberality towards *pro se* litigants, *Nance v. Kelly*, 912 F.2d 605, 606 (2d Cir.1990) (per curiam), and extreme caution should be exercised in ordering sua sponte dismissal of a *pro se* complaint before the adverse party has been served and the parties have had an opportunity to respond, *Anderson v. Coughlin*, 700 F.2d 37, 41 (2d Cir.1983), there is a responsibility on the court to determine that a claim is not frivolous before permitting a plaintiff to proceed with an action in forma pauperis. Dismissal of frivolous actions pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) is appropriate to prevent abuses of the process of the court, *Harkins v. Eldredge*, 505 F.2d 802, 804 (8th Cir.1974), as well as to discourage the waste of judicial resources. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. See generally *Moreman*, 848 F.Supp. at 334.

*2 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is the vehicle by which individuals may seek redress for alleged violations of their constitutional rights. See, e.g., *Von Ritter v. Heald*, 91–CV–612, 1994 WL 688306, *3, 1994 U.S.Dist. LEXIS 17698, *8–9 (N.D.N.Y. Nov. 14, 1994) (McAvoy, C.J.). A party may not be held liable under this section unless it can be established that the defendant has acted under the color of state law. See, e.g., *Rounseville v. Zahl*, 13 F.3rd 625, 628 (2d Cir.1994) (noting state action requirement under § 1983); *Wise v. Battistoni*, 92–Civ–4288, 1992 WL 380914, *1, 1992 U.S.Dist. LEXIS 18864, *2–3 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 10, 1992) (same) (citations omitted).

In the present case, the sole defendant named by plaintiff is the Rensselaer County public defender who apparently represented plaintiff in the criminal proceeding discussed in

1995 WL 236245

his complaint. *See* Complaint at 2. However, “[i]t is well settled that an attorney’s representation of a party to a court proceeding does not satisfy the [Section 1983](#) requirement that the defendant is alleged to have acted under color of state law....” *Wise*, 1992 WL 380914 at *1, 1992 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18864 at *2–3; *see also D’Ottavio v. Depetris*, 91–Civ–6133, 1991 WL 206278, *1, 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13526, *1–2 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 26, 1991).

Since the plaintiff has not alleged any state action with respect to the [Section 1983](#) claim presently before the Court, plaintiff’s complaint, as presented to this Court, cannot be supported by any arguable basis in law and must therefore be dismissed pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 1915\(d\)](#). *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 328.

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED, that leave to proceed or prosecute this action in forma pauperis is denied, and it is further

ORDERED, that this action is dismissed pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 1915\(d\)](#) and Local Rule 5.4(a) of the General Rules of this Court as lacking any arguable basis in law, and it is further

ORDERED, that the Clerk serve a copy of this Order on the plaintiff by regular mail.

I further certify that any appeal from this matter would not be taken in good faith pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 1915\(a\)](#).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

All Citations

Not Reported in F.Supp., 1995 WL 236245

End of Document

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

2022 WL 767654

2022 WL 767654

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, E.D. New York.

Brian P. ALTMAN, Plaintiff,

v.

NASSAU COUNTY DISTRICT

ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, et al., Defendants.

22-CV-987 (PKC) (ARL)

|

Signed 03/14/2022

Attorneys and Law Firms

Brian P. Altman, East Meadow, NY, Pro Se.

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

PAMELA K. CHEN, United States District Judge:

*1 On February 18, 2022, *pro se* Plaintiff Brian P. Altman, currently detained at Nassau County Correctional Facility, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 related to his pending state court prosecution. Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. For the following reasons, the Complaint is dismissed and Plaintiff is granted thirty (30) days to file an amended complaint.

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleges that he was arrested on December 6, 2021 in Levittown, New York and arraigned the next day. (Complaint, Dkt. 1, at ECF ¹ 4.) He asserts that he should have been released because his "grand jury action/felony exam" was delayed multiple times, he remained detained on excessive bail, and he "has never been heard or produced to court." (*Id.* at ECF 4–6.) Plaintiff "seeks compensation for being held in [extended] confinement" and "compensation for what this incident has done to his mental/emotional conditions."² (*Id.* at ECF 6.)

¹ Citations to "ECF" refer to the pagination generated by the Court's CM/ECF docketing system and not the document's internal pagination.

2

Plaintiff has sought injunctive relief in state court. (Complaint, Dkt. 1, at ECF 5.)

LEGAL STANDARD

The Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA") requires courts to screen civil complaints brought by incarcerated persons against governmental entities, officers, or employees. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b). The PLRA requires a court to dismiss a plaintiff's complaint if it "is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief." *Id.* The *in forma pauperis* statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), requires courts to dismiss for the same reasons. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *see also Abbas v. Dixon*, 480 F.3d 636, 639–40 (2d Cir. 2007) (applying both Sections 1915A and 1915(e)(2) where the plaintiff proceeded *in forma pauperis*). A reviewing court must "accept all 'well-pleaded factual allegations' in the complaint as true." *Lynch v. City of New York*, 952 F.3d 67, 74–75 (2d Cir. 2020) (quoting *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009)).

DISCUSSION

Section "1983 does not confer any substantive rights, but merely provides a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred." *Vill. of Freeport v. Barrella*, 814 F.3d 594, 600 n.8 (2d Cir. 2016) (citation and quotations omitted). "To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that defendants violated plaintiff's federal rights while acting under color of state law." *McGugan v. Aldana-Bernier*, 752 F.3d 224, 229 (2d Cir. 2014) (citations omitted).

I. Nassau County District Attorney's Office

Defendant Nassau County District Attorney's Office ("NCDA") is immune from suit. The Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that the "[j]udicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State." U.S. Const. amend. XI. Under the Eleventh Amendment, "States retain their immunity from suit regardless of the citizenship of the plaintiff." *PennEast Pipeline Co., LLC v. New Jersey*, 141 S. Ct. 2244, 2258 (2021). Thus, "[a]lthough by its terms the Amendment applies only to suits against a State by citizens of another State," the Supreme Court has "extended

2022 WL 767654

the Amendment's applicability to suits by citizens against their own States,' as 'the ultimate guarantee of the Eleventh Amendment is that nonconsenting States may not be sued by private individuals in federal court.' ” *T.W. v. New York State Bd. of L. Examiners*, 996 F.3d 87, 92 (2d Cir. 2021) (brackets omitted) (quoting *Bd. of Trs. of the Univ. of Ala. v. Garrett*, 531 U.S. 356, 363 (2001)).

*2 Eleventh Amendment immunity extends to local governments and to a district attorney's office exercising its prosecutorial functions. *See, e.g., Baskerville v. Richmond Cnty.*, No. 19-CV-2 (AMD), 2019 WL 2162595, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. May 16, 2019) (holding that the “plaintiff's claims against the Office of the Richmond County District Attorney concern[ed] its prosecution of the plaintiff” and thus that “the plaintiff's claims [were] barred by the Eleventh Amendment”); *White v. Vance*, No. 10-CV-6142 (NRB), 2011 WL 2565476, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. June 21, 2011) (“[B]ecause plaintiff asserts claims for monetary relief, any claims against the [New York County District Attorney's] Office are also barred by the Eleventh Amendment.”). The Eleventh Amendment therefore bars Plaintiff's claim against the NCDA, which is related to its prosecution of Plaintiff and seeks money damages.

II. NCDA Attorney

The other Defendant, an unnamed NCDA Assistant District Attorney, also is immune. “The doctrine of absolute immunity applies broadly to shield a prosecutor from liability for money damages (but not injunctive relief) in a § 1983 lawsuit, even when the result may be that a wronged plaintiff is left without an immediate remedy.” *Anilao v. Spota*, 2022 WL 697663, at *4, — F.4th — (2d Cir. Mar. 9, 2022). “The immunity covers virtually all acts, regardless of motivation, associated with the prosecutor's function as an advocate.” *Id.* (quotations and brackets omitted). Plaintiff's claim against the NCDA

Assistant District Attorney, which seeks monetary damages, therefore must be dismissed. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii), 1915A(b).

III. Leave to Amend

Given Plaintiff's *pro se* status, the Court will allow Plaintiff thirty (30) days to file an amended complaint. *See* Fed R. Civ. P. 15(a); *see, e.g., Davis v. Goord*, 320 F.3d 346, 352 (2d Cir. 2003) (“Certainly the court should not dismiss without granting leave to amend at least once when a liberal reading of the [*pro se*] complaint gives any indication that a valid claim might be stated.”). If Plaintiff chooses to file an amended complaint, he must do so within thirty (30) days of this Order. The amended complaint must be captioned “Amended Complaint” and bear the same docket number as this Order. Plaintiff is advised that the amended complaint completely replaces the original complaint; therefore, all claims Plaintiff wishes to pursue must be in the amended complaint. Plaintiff is further advised that the amended complaint will be dismissed on the same immunity grounds as the current Complaint if it seeks monetary damages from the same defendants.

CONCLUSION

The Complaint is dismissed, and Plaintiff is granted thirty (30) days to file an amended complaint. The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal would not be taken in good faith and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444–45 (1962).

All Citations

Slip Copy, 2022 WL 767654

End of Document

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

2019 WL 2162595

2019 WL 2162595

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, E.D. New York.

Kevin BASKERVILLE, Plaintiff,

v.

RICHMOND COUNTY FAMILY COURT; Richmond County Criminal Court; [Administration for Children's Services](#); Forensic Psychology Services of New York, PLLC; Law Office of Ralph J. Porzio, Esq. PLLC; Office of the District Attorney Richmond County, Defendant.

19-CV-00602 (AMD) (LB)

|

Signed 05/16/2019

Attorneys and Law Firms

Kevin Baskerville, Staten Island, NY, pro se.

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

[Ann M. Donnelly](#), United States District Judge

*1 On January 29, 2019, the plaintiff, Kevin Baskerville, commenced this *pro se* action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to [42 U.S.C. § 1983](#). The complaint was dismissed on March 19, 2019, and the plaintiff was directed to file an amended complaint. (ECF No. 6.) The plaintiff served an amended complaint on April 29, 2019. (ECF No. 9.) The plaintiff paid the statutory filing fee to commence this action. (ECF No. 4.) For the reasons that follow, the claims against Richmond County Family Court, Richmond County Criminal Court, and the Office of the Richmond County District Attorney are dismissed.

BACKGROUND

The plaintiff's lawsuit is premised on his claim that the defendants failed to intervene in the mental, physical, and emotional abuse of his daughter by the daughter's mother and the mother's boyfriend. (Amended Complaint, ECF No. 9, ¶¶ 14, 35, 54, 68, 84, 113.) For example, he claims that Administration for Children's Services, Forensic Psychological Services of New York, and the Law Office of Ralph J. Porzio publicly humiliated, harassed, and verbally abused him, permitted the child's mother to have unsupervised

visits, and did not inform the court that the child was being abused. (*Id.* ¶¶ 56, 63, 66, 68, 77, 82, 94, 97.) The plaintiff also claims that these defendants prevented him from expressing his concerns in violation of his First Amendment rights. (*Id.* ¶¶ 64, 78, 93.)

In addition, the plaintiff makes allegations against Richmond County Family Court, Richmond County Criminal Court, and the Office of the Suffolk County District Attorney, including that they failed to enforce an order of protection protecting his daughter. (*Id.* ¶¶ 18, 36, 107.) He further claims that he was falsely arrested and imprisoned and prevented from presenting evidence to refute claims against himself. (*Id.* ¶¶ 24, 37, 48, 102, 110.) The plaintiff alleges that he is unable to obtain employment or a new residence since he cannot pass a background check. (*Id.* ¶ 112.)

The plaintiff claims that the defendants' unconstitutional and negligent treatment of him and his daughter caused him mental and emotional distress, as well as loss of salary and business opportunities due to court-ordered appearances. (*Id.* ¶¶ 22, 32, 41, 57, 59, 73, 86, 97, 104.)

STANDARD OF REVIEW

A federal court must “liberally construe[]” pleadings by *pro se* parties, who are held to less stringent standards than attorneys. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007); *see also Harris v. Mills*, 572 F.3d 66, 72 (2d Cir. 2009); *McPherson v. Coombe*, 174 F.3d 276, 280 (2d Cir. 1999). Nevertheless, a district court may dismiss a *pro se* action *sua sponte* – even if the plaintiff has paid the requisite filing fee – if the action is frivolous. *Fitzgerald v. First East Seventh Street Tenants Corp.*, 221 F.3d 362, 363-64 (2d Cir. 2000). A complaint is frivolous when “ ‘it is clear that the defendants are immune from suit.’ ” *Montero v. Travis*, 171 F.3d 757, 760 (2d Cir. 1999) (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 327 (1989)); *see also Jolley v. Chatigny*, No. 04-Civ-182, 2004 WL 306116, at *2 (D. Conn. Feb. 12, 2004) (when it is clear that the defendants are immune from suit, a dispositive defense appears on the face of the complaint, and the action can be dismissed as frivolous).

DISCUSSION

*2 The plaintiff's claims against Richmond County Criminal Court, Richmond County Family Court, and the Office of

2019 WL 2162595

the Richmond County District Attorney must be dismissed because they are state entities and immune from suit. The Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution “bar[s] federal suits against state governments by a state's own citizens.” *Woods v. Rondout Valley Cent. Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ.*, 466 F.3d 232, 236 (2d Cir. 2006). This bar precludes suits for money damages, as well as injunctive relief. See *McGinty v. New York*, 251 F.3d 84, 91 (2d Cir. 2001). Moreover, sovereign immunity extends “beyond the states themselves to ‘state agents and state instrumentalities’ that are, effectively, arms of a state.” *Woods*, 466 F.3d at 236 (quoting *Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Doe*, 519 U.S. 425, 429 (1997)).

Richmond County Criminal Court and Richmond County Family Court are arms of the state and thus immune from suit. The Second Circuit has ruled that “the New York State Unified Court System is unquestionably an arm of the State, and is entitled to Eleventh Amendment sovereign immunity.” *Gollomp v. Spitzer*, 568 F.3d 355, 366 (2d Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). New York has not waived its Eleventh Amendment immunity to suit in federal court, and Congress did not abrogate the state's immunity in enacting 42 U.S.C. § 1983 or any other statute that the plaintiff cites in his complaint. See *Trotman v. Palisades Interstate Park Comm'n*, 557 F.2d 35, 39-40 (2d Cir. 1977).

The Office of the Richmond County District Attorney is also entitled to Eleventh Amendment immunity. See, e.g., *Ying Jing Gan v. City of New York*, 996 F.2d 522, 536 (2d Cir. 1993) (a district attorney is entitled to Eleventh Amendment immunity when the plaintiff's “claims center[] ... on decisions

whether or not, and on what charges to prosecute”); see also *Shmueli v. City of New York*, 424 F.3d 231, 236 (2d Cir. 2005) (finding that absolute immunity protects a prosecutor “not only from liability but also from suit”). The plaintiff's claims against the Office of the Richmond County District Attorney concern its prosecution of the plaintiff and its decision about whether to prosecute the mother of the plaintiff's daughter. Thus, the plaintiff's claims are barred by the Eleventh Amendment.

CONCLUSION

The plaintiff's claims against Richmond County Family Court, Richmond County Criminal Court, and the Office of the Richmond County District Attorney, are dismissed. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii). The Clerk of Court is directed to amend the caption to reflect the dismissal of these parties.

The case is referred to the Honorable Lois Bloom, United States Magistrate Judge, for pretrial supervision. The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

All Citations

Not Reported in Fed. Supp., 2019 WL 2162595

End of Document

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

2011 WL 2565476

2011 WL 2565476

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,
S.D. New York.

Giovanni WHITE, Plaintiff,

v.

Cyrus VANCE Jr. (Chief District Attorney), NYC's
23rd Precinct, Islamic Cultural Center, Department
of Corrections, Lawrence D. Gerzog, Esq., Maria
G. Worley, Esq., Howard D. Simmons, Esq., Carlos
Fortunato, New York State Police Forensic Investigation
Center, and African Islamic Mission, Defendants.

No. 10 CV 6142(NRB).

|

June 21, 2011.

Attorneys and Law Firms

Giovanni S. White, East Elmhurst, NY, for Plaintiff.

[Inna Reznik, Esq.](#), Assistant Attorney General, State of New
York, Office of the Attorney General, New York, NY, for
Defendant NYSPFIC.

[Cynthia Sittnick, Esq.](#), Assistant District Attorney, County of
New York, New York, NY, for Defendant Vance.

[Joseph A. Marutollo, Esq.](#), Law Department, City of New
York, New York, NY, for Defendant DOC.

Howard D. Simmons, Esq., New York, NY, pro se.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

[NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD](#), District Judge.

*1 Plaintiff Giovanni White (“plaintiff”), currently
incarcerated at the Anna M. Kross Correctional Facility on
Rikers Island, brings this *pro se* action for damages pursuant
to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff names various institutional
and individual defendants and alleges, *inter alia*, that he
was wrongfully arrested, wrongfully prosecuted, subjected to
DNA testing without a warrant, assaulted while incarcerated,
and that his personal mail was improperly opened and/or
confiscated at the correctional facility.

Four motions are presently pending before this Court: (i)
a motion to dismiss by defendant New York State Police
Forensic Investigation Center (“NYSPFIC”), in which the
NYSPFIC contends, among other things, that it is immune
from suit under the Eleventh Amendment to the United States
Constitution; (ii) a motion to dismiss by defendant Cyrus
Vance Jr. (“Vance”), in which Vance contends, among other
things, that there exists no plausible claim for relief against
Vance or against the New York County District Attorney's
Office; (iii) a motion to dismiss by defendant New York
City Department of Correction (“DOC”), in which the DOC
contends, among other things, that it is not a suable entity; and
(iv) a motion to dismiss by defendant Howard D. Simmons,
Esq. (“Simmons”), in which Simmons contends that plaintiff
does not assert a plausible claim against him.

For the reasons discussed herein, we grant each of the above-
mentioned motions.

BACKGROUND

On October 27, 2008, plaintiff was arrested near the
intersection of 97th Street and Second Avenue in
Manhattan.¹ (Compl. at 3.) At the time of his arrest, plaintiff
was suspected of committing a burglary a few days earlier.
(Compl. at 3.) Shortly thereafter, plaintiff was charged with
trespassing and was arraigned on those charges. (Compl. at 3.)

¹ Except where noted, the following facts are drawn
from plaintiff's complaint and the exhibits attached
thereto. For purposes of reviewing this motion to
dismiss, all nonconclusory allegations are accepted
as true. See *S. Cherry St., LLC v. Hennessie Grp.*
LLC, 573 F.3d 98, 100 (2d Cir.2009). Because
plaintiff's complaint does not include numbered
paragraphs, citations to the complaint (“Compl.
at ___”) are citations to the page number of the
complaint where the allegation appears.

Plaintiff was represented by appointed counsel at the
arraignment. On the date of the arraignment, a detective
allegedly took two buccal swabs from plaintiff to obtain a
DNA sample. Plaintiff alleges that the detective did not have
a warrant for the sample and further alleges that government
authorities failed to obtain a warrant before accessing his
DNA profile information, which was on file at the NYSPFIC.
(Compl. at 3–4.)

2011 WL 2565476

A few months later, plaintiff pleaded guilty to the October 2008 trespass charge and received a sentence of 90 days' time served. (Compl. at 3–4.) However, on February 23, 2009, when plaintiff remained incarcerated on the trespass charge, plaintiff was indicted and charged with burglary stemming from the same October 2008 incident. (Compl. at 3–4.)

Plaintiff remained incarcerated while his criminal case continued. Plaintiff alleges that, while incarcerated, he was housed with a possible sex offender, he suffered physical injuries, and inmates and/or DOC personnel opened or confiscated his correspondence. (Compl. at 4.)

In or around October of 2009, plaintiff filed a notice of claim against the City of New York, which included allegations of wrongful arrest, malicious prosecution, and a litany of complaints about his treatment while incarcerated. (Compl. at 8.) Thereafter, plaintiff submitted a complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which was received by the *Pro Se* Office on June 8, 2010 and which was filed on August 17, 2010. In his complaint, plaintiff seeks \$7.5 million in damages. (Compl. at 7.)

DISCUSSION

I. Legal Standard

*2 When deciding a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court must accept as true all well-pleaded facts alleged in the complaint and draw all reasonable inferences in plaintiffs' favor. *Kassner v. 2nd Ave. Delicatessen, Inc.*, 496 F.3d 229, 237 (2d Cir.2007). A complaint must include “enough facts to state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 1974, 167 L.Ed.2d 929, 949 (2007). Where a plaintiff has not “nudged [his] claims across the line from conceivable to plausible, [his] complaint must be dismissed.” *Id.* This pleading standard applies in “all civil actions.” *Aschcroft v. Iqbal*, — U.S. —, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1953, 173 L.Ed.2d 868, 887 (2009).

Where, as here, a complaint is filed by a *pro se* plaintiff, the complaint should be reviewed under a more lenient standard than that applied to “formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520, 92 S.Ct. 594, 596, 30 L.Ed.2d 652, 654 (1972) (per curiam). In other words, courts must interpret such pleadings “to raise the strongest arguments that they suggest.” *Burgos v. Hopkins*, 14

F.3d 787, 790 (2d Cir.1994). Nevertheless, *pro se* plaintiffs remain subject to the general standard applicable to all civil complaints under the Supreme Court's decisions in *Twombly* and *Iqbal*. See *Schwamborn v. County of Nassau*, 348 F. App'x 634, 635 (2d Cir.2009).

B. 42 U.S.C. § 1983

To maintain a § 1983 action, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements. First, “the conduct complained of must have been committed by a person acting under color of state law.” *Pitchell v. Callan*, 13 F.3d 545, 547 (2d Cir.1994). Second, “the conduct complained of must have deprived a person of rights, privileges, or immunities, secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States.” *Id.* (internal citation omitted).

The statute of limitations that applies to claims brought under § 1983 is three years. *Owens v. Okure*, 488 U.S. 235, 249–51, 109 S.Ct. 573, 581–82, 102 L.Ed.2d 594, 604–06 (1989) § New York's three-year statute of limitations for general personal injury claims applies to claims brought under (1983); *Patterson v. County of Oneida*, 375 F.3d 206, 225 (2d Cir.2004); see also N.Y. C.P.L.R. 214(5).

II. Moving Defendants

A. Defendant New York State Police Forensic Investigation Center

In his complaint, plaintiff alleges that unnamed authorities failed to obtain a search warrant before accessing plaintiff's pre-existing DNA profile information from the NYSPFIC. (Compl. at 4 .) In its motion, the NYSPFIC contends that, as a state agency, it is immune from suit and therefore this action should be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule 12(b)(1) for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.²

2 A case is properly dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1) when the district court lacks the statutory or constitutional power to adjudicate it. *Makarova v. United States*, 201 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir.2000). The plaintiff has the burden of proving that subject matter jurisdiction exists by a preponderance of the evidence. *Id.*

We agree. The Eleventh Amendment bars from federal court all suits by private parties against a state unless the state consents to such a suit or Congress has expressly abrogated

the state's immunity. See *Bd. of Trs. of the Univ. of Ala. v. Garrett*, 531 U.S. 356, 363–64, 121 S.Ct. 955, 961–62, 148 L.Ed.2d 866, 876–77 (2001); *Kimel v. Fla. Bd. of Regents*, 528 U.S. 62, 72–73, 120 S.Ct. 631, 640, 145 L.Ed.2d 522, 535–36 (2000). Additionally, a state's immunity extends to state agencies such as NYSPFIC. See *Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781, 782, 98 S.Ct. 3057, 3057, 57 L.Ed.2d 1114, 1116 (1978); *Dube v. State Univ. of New York*, 900 F.2d 587, 594–95 (2d Cir.1990).

*3 Because neither the State of New York nor its agencies have consented to be sued in federal court under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and because Congress has not abrogated the state's immunity, see *Garrett*, 531 U.S. at 363–64, plaintiff's claims against NYSPFIC are barred by the Eleventh Amendment and are dismissed.³

3 The NYSPFIC also moves to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule 12(b)(4), on the grounds that it was not properly served. Because we conclude that plaintiff's claims against NYSPFIC are barred by the Eleventh Amendment, we do not address the arguments regarding service. That said, we understand NYSPFIC's argument to be that the method of service was improper, and challenges to the method of service, rather than to deficiencies in the papers served, are properly raised under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(5). See 2 James Wm. Moore et al., *Moore's Federal Practice* § 12.33[1] (3d ed. 2010) (“[A] Rule 12(b)(4) motion challenges the *form* of process, and a Rule 12(b)(5) motion challenges the *method* of serving process.”) (emphasis in original).

B. Defendant Cyrus Vance Jr.

As briefly noted above, plaintiff alleges that he was wrongfully arrested and prosecuted for trespassing and burglary in the third degree. According to plaintiff, he was arrested for trespassing in late October 2008, later pleaded guilty to that charge, and then was indicted for burglary in February 2009, when he remained incarcerated on the trespassing charge. (Compl. at 3–4.) Vance moves to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule 12(b)(6), arguing that plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. In his motion, Vance advances three principal arguments, which we address in turn.

First, Vance argues that the claims against him must be dismissed because there are no allegations that Vance was personally involved in any misconduct.

We agree. The Supreme Court recently reiterated that vicarious liability is inapplicable to claims under § 1983. *Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. at 1948. Rather, “a plaintiff must plead that each Government-official defendant, through the official's own individual actions, has violated the Constitution.” *Id.*; see also *Blyden v. Mancusi*, 186 F.3d 252, 264 (2d Cir.1999) (“Because Section 1983 imposes liability only upon those who actually cause a deprivation of rights, ‘personal involvement of defendants in alleged constitutional deprivations is a prerequisite to an award of damages under § 1983.’”) (quoting *Wright v. Smith*, 21 F.3d 496, 501 (2d Cir.1994)); *Ying Jing Gan v. City of New York*, 996 F.2d 522, 536 (2d Cir.1993) (“To the extent that the complaint sought to assert individual-capacity claims against Morgenthau, plaintiffs fare no better, for a supervisory official cannot be held liable under § 1983 on a theory of respondeat superior.”).

Here, plaintiff has failed to allege that Vance was personally involved in underlying events. The prosecutions about which plaintiff complains stem from an arrest that occurred in late 2008 and an indictment returned by a grand jury in February 2009—plainly before Vance took office as the District Attorney of New York County in January 2010. Moreover, even though one of the prosecutions appears to have extended into 2010, plaintiff does not allege that Vance was personally involved in any misconduct.

Second, according to Vance, even if plaintiff had named Vance's predecessor, then-District Attorney Robert M. Morgenthau, as a defendant in this action, Morgenthau would be protected by absolute immunity.

Again, we agree. Absolute immunity for prosecutors exists to protect them from “harassment by unfounded litigation [that] would cause a deflection of the prosecutor's energies from his public duties, and the possibility that he would shade his decisions instead of exercising the independence of judgment required by the public trust.” *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 423, 96 S.Ct. 984, 991, 47 L.Ed.2d 128, 139 (1976). Such immunity typically applies when a prosecutor acts as “an officer of the court,” *Van de Kamp v. Goldstein*, 555 U.S. 335, 129 S.Ct. 855, 861, 172 L.Ed.2d 706, 713 (2009), or performs activities “closely associated with the judicial process.” See *Doe v. Phillips*, 81 F.3d 1204, 1209 (2d Cir.1996). On the other hand, absolute immunity is

2011 WL 2565476

unavailable when the challenged conduct does not concern a traditional function of a prosecutor or is unconnected with the judicial process. *See, e.g., Burns v. Reed*, 500 U.S. 478, 495, 111 S.Ct. 1934, 1944, 114 L.Ed.2d 547, 564 (1991); *Phillips*, 81 F.3d at 1209.

*4 In the instant action, plaintiff makes no allegations that would enable us to infer that prosecutorial immunity would be unavailable to Morgenthau or, for that matter, to any Assistant District Attorneys acting as officers of the court.

Third, Vance argues that plaintiff could not name the New York County District Attorney's Office ("Office") as a defendant because the Office is not a suable entity and because it is protected from suits for money damages by the Eleventh Amendment.

We agree that plaintiff could not properly name the Office as a defendant in this action. The capacity of the Office to be sued is determined by New York law, *see Woodward v. Office of DA*, 689 F.Supp.2d 655, 658 (S.D.N.Y.2010), and "[u]nder New York law, the [Office] does not have a legal existence separate from the District Attorney." *Id.* (quoting *Gonzalez v. City of New York*, No. 98 Civ. 6081(MBM), 1999 WL 549016, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 28, 1999)); *see also Steed v. Delohery*, No. 96 Civ. 2449(RPP), 1998 WL 440861, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 4, 1998) ("The New York County District Attorney's Office is not a suable entity."). Thus, if we construed the complaint as asserting a claim against the Office, we would dismiss such a claim.

Moreover, because plaintiff asserts claims for monetary relief, any claims against the Office are also barred by the Eleventh Amendment. *See Woodward*, 689 F.Supp.2d at 659. Because the Office is an agency of the State of New York, *see Ying Jing Gan*, 996 F.2d at 536 (when prosecuting a criminal matter, the Office represents the State of New York), and because the state has not consented to suit nor has Congress abrogated the state's immunity, any claims against the Office are also barred by the Eleventh Amendment and must be dismissed.

Accordingly, we grant Vance's motion to dismiss.⁴

⁴ Vance also argues that any purported state law claims should be dismissed. We address this argument in section IV, *infra*.

C. Defendant Department of Corrections

Plaintiff makes a number of allegations against the DOC, including that he suffered physical injuries while incarcerated, that his mail was tampered with by fellow inmates and by corrections officers,⁵ that he was housed with a possible sex offender, and that he was retaliated against for filing a civil lawsuit against the New York State Department of Correctional Services in 2004 for negligence. The DOC moves to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule 12(b) (6), arguing that plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. In its motion, the DOC raises three principal arguments, which we address in turn.

5 Plaintiff alleges a series of grievances related to his mail: that his pen pal's address and phone number were stolen in August 2003; that other inmates have doctored his letters and then claimed that plaintiff authored the doctored letters; that a magazine and forty photocopies of his female friend in lingerie were stolen from the package facility at the Manhattan Detention Complex; that Corrections Officers passed out the contact information of plaintiff's friends to other inmates; and that plaintiff has not received responses to the letters he sends out. (Compl. at 4–5.)

First, the DOC asserts that, as a municipal agency, it cannot be sued. We agree. Under the New York City Charter, "[a]ll actions and proceedings for the recovery of penalties for the violation of any law shall be brought in the name of the city of New York and not that of any agency, except where otherwise provided by law." New York City Charter Ch. 17, § 396. Thus, as an agency of the City of New York, the DOC is not a suable entity. *See New York City Charter Ch. 25, § 621 et seq.; see also Renelique v. Doe*, No. 99 Civ. 10425(LTS)(HBP), 2003 WL 23023771, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 29, 2003) (collecting cases).

*5 Second, the DOC argues that if the Court were to construe the complaint as including a claim against the City of New York ("City"), such a claim should be dismissed. It is well settled that a municipality can only be sued under § 1983 if the alleged injury was the result of an official policy, custom, or practice of the municipality. *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 644, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 2037–38, 56 L.Ed.2d 611, 638 (1978); *see also Zahra v. Town of Southold*, 48 F.3d 674, 685 (2d Cir.1995). Plaintiff, however, has pointed to no policy, custom, or practice on the part of the City that might plausibly have caused any of plaintiff's alleged constitutional injuries. Thus, even if plaintiff had properly joined the City

2011 WL 2565476

in this lawsuit—which he did not—we would be compelled to dismiss any *Monell* claim.

Third, the DOC contends that even if plaintiff were to name a proper defendant, plaintiff fails to allege any cognizable constitutional violations. We address the plausible violations, interpreting the complaint to raise the strongest arguments that it suggests.

Regarding plaintiff's alleged physical injuries, plaintiff states that he was treated for those injuries at Albany Medical Center and Erie County Hospital. (Compl. at 4.) Thus, the allegations appear to date back to the early 2000s, when plaintiff was incarcerated at correctional facilities in upstate New York, rather than to his present period of incarceration at correctional facilities in New York City. If the injuries occurred during that time frame, any excessive force or deliberate indifference claim (if asserted against an appropriate defendant) would be time-barred.

With respect to plaintiff's allegations that he was housed with a possible sex offender and that he was retaliated against for having filed a lawsuit against the state corrections agency in 2004, plaintiff makes no more than the most conclusory of allegations. Accordingly, even assuming these claims were timely filed, plaintiff does not meet his pleading obligations under *Iqbal* and *Twombly*.

With respect to the alleged mail tampering, prisoners have a right to “the free flow of incoming and outgoing mail” under the First Amendment. *Johnson v. Goord*, 445 F.3d 532, 534 (2d Cir.2006) (citing *Davis v. Goord*, 320 F.3d 346, 351 (2d Cir.2003)). However, it is well-settled that “[a] prisoner's right to receive and send mail ... may be regulated,” and “[s]uch regulation is valid if it is reasonably related to legitimate penological interests.” *Johnson*, 445 F.3d at 534 (internal quotations omitted). Thus, to assert a violation of the First Amendment, an inmate must allege that “prison officials ‘regularly and unjustifiably’ interfered with his personal mail.” *DeLeon v. Doe*, 361 F.3d 93, 94 (2d Cir.2004) (per curiam).

As a threshold matter, a correctional facility may authorize the confiscation of nude or semi-nude photographs of the spouses or girlfriends of inmates. See *Giano v. Senkowski*, 54 F.3d 1050, 1053–56 (2d Cir.1995) (upholding prison policy that banned inmates' possession of nude or semi-nude photographs of spouses or girlfriends); see also *Thornburgh v. Abbott*, 490 U.S. 401, 403–05, 109 S.Ct. 1874, 1876–77, 104

L.Ed.2d 459, 466–68 (1989) (upholding the facial validity of regulations barring “sexually explicit material which by its nature or content poses a threat to the security, good order, or discipline of the institution, or facilitates criminal activity”). Thus, if plaintiff's allegations are limited to the facility's confiscation of a magazine and 40 semi-nude photographs, then such allegations do not state a plausible claim that prison officials “regularly and unjustifiably” interfered with his personal mail. See *DeLeon*, 361 F.3d at 94.

*6 Furthermore, plaintiff attaches to his complaint a summary of DOC regulations regarding the monitoring and confiscation of mail. Pursuant to these regulations, DOC personnel may monitor or confiscate incoming or outgoing mail if: (i) DOC personnel have a reasonable belief that an inmate's mail poses a threat to public safety or to the security and order of the facility; (ii) the facility's warden issues a written order documenting that belief; and (iii) the inmate is notified of the warden's order. As alleged, plaintiff does not challenge the validity of the policy, does not allege a policy, practice, or custom of improper monitoring or confiscation of personal mail, nor does he allege that the facility failed to provide notice to him of the items that were confiscated.⁶ Rather, plaintiff alleges that his mail was confiscated on a single occasion and speculates that inmates and/or DOC personnel tampered with his mail on other occasions.

⁶ Given the precise detail of what plaintiff believes is missing (*i.e.*, a magazine and 40 photocopies of a photograph of a semi-nude woman), we must conclude that plaintiff was notified that DOC personnel reviewed his correspondence. Moreover, based on plaintiff's description of the confiscated material, and in light of the age of the young woman in the photographs, it appears that it is within the DOC's legitimate penological interests to confiscate the material.

As a result, we conclude that plaintiff has failed to assert a plausible First Amendment claim. If plaintiff has additional evidence upon which to ground a viable First Amendment claim (*i.e.*, additional facts regarding the regular and unjustified interference with his mail), plaintiff may file an amended pleading limited to this issue.

Accordingly, we grant the DOC's motion to dismiss.⁷

⁷ Like Vance, the DOC argues that any purported state law claims should be dismissed. We address

2011 WL 2565476

the purported state law claims in section IV, *infra*. In addition, the DOC contends that it was improperly served, and that the complaint should be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule 12(b)(5). According to the DOC, service was improper because it was not affected by the United States Marshals Service and because the affidavit of service lacked certain requisite information. Again, because we dismiss the complaint pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), we decline to address the DOC's argument that service was improper.

D. Defendant Howard D. Simmons, Esq.

In his complaint, plaintiff mentions Simmons once, explaining that Simmons was appointed to represent plaintiff in connection with a state criminal case against him. (Compl. at 3 (“Representing 18–B Lawyers that were assigned to Plaintiff's Felony case were: Lawrence Schwartz, Esq., Howard D. Simmons, Esq., [and] Chris J. Johnson, Esq.”).)

Simmons moves to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule 12(b)(6), arguing that plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. In response, plaintiff asserts that Simmons failed to act in plaintiff's best interests, that Simmons tampered with DNA evidence in an attempt to convict plaintiff, and that Simmons requested unnecessary adjournments and failed to show up to court.

We agree that plaintiff has not stated a plausible claim against Simmons. Plaintiff nowhere asserts that Simmons was acting under color of state law. See *Dennis v. Sparks*, 449 U.S. 24, 29 n. 4, 101 S.Ct. 183, 187 n. 4, 66 L.Ed. 2d 185, 190 n. 4 (1980) (to act under color of state law, a plaintiff must allege that a private person was “a willful participant in joint activity with the State or its agents”); *Dahlberg v. Becker*, 748 F.2d 85, 92–93 (2d Cir.1984) (dismissing complaint for failure to state a claim and holding that “mere invocation by [the individual] defendants of New York's legal procedures does not constitute joint participation” for the purpose of alleging that the defendants acted under color of state law). More generally, plaintiff's complaint fails to include “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (citing Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2)), and thus fails to give Simmons “fair notice of what the ... claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Id.* (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47, 78 S.Ct. 99, 103, 2 L.Ed.2d 80, 85 (1957)). Indeed, this complaint is wholly devoid of any factual allegations regarding Simmons'

actions or inactions that would raise plaintiff's right to relief above a merely speculative level.

*7 Thus, we grant Simmons' motion to dismiss.

III. Non–Moving Defendants

Apart from the four moving defendants, there are six additional defendants named in the complaint, none of whom has made an appearance in this case.⁸ Although the non-moving defendants have not made an appearance in this action, the Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or an officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In light of this authority, a court must dismiss a complaint, or portion thereof, that states a frivolous or malicious claim, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B), 1915A(b); see also *Abbas v. Dixon*, 480 F.3d 636, 639 (2d Cir.2007).

⁸ To date, the Court has authorized the mailing of three service packages to plaintiff and has granted plaintiff extensions of time to serve.

Additionally, while the pleading of a *pro se* litigant should be liberally construed in his favor, a complaint that is “so confused, ambiguous, vague or otherwise unintelligible that its true substance, if any, is well disguised,” fails to comply with Rule 8, and may be dismissed sua sponte. *Salahuddin v. Cuomo*, 861 F.2d 40, 42 (2d Cir.1988); see also *Fitzgerald v. First E. Seventh St. Tenants Corp.*, 221 F.3d 362, 363–64 (2d Cir.2000).

With these standards in mind, we review plaintiff's allegations concerning the remaining six defendants.

A. Defendant “NYC's 23rd Precinct”

Pursuant to our authority to screen complaints brought by prisoners against a governmental entity, we dismiss the claims against defendant “NYC's 23rd Precinct” (“Precinct”). As discussed above, under the New York City Charter, a private plaintiff is generally prohibited from suing a municipal agency. See New York City Charter Ch. 17, § 396. Like the DOC, the New York Police Department (“NYPD”) and its subdivisions are agencies of the City that may not be sued. See, e.g., *Jenkins v. City of New York*, 478 F.3d 76, 93 n. 19 (2d Cir.2007) (N.Y.P.D. is not a suable entity); *Morris*

2011 WL 2565476

v. New York City Police Dep't, 59 F. App'x 421, 422 (2d Cir.2003) (same); *Emerson v. City of New York*, 740 F.Supp.2d 385, 395–96 (S.D.N.Y.2010) (N.Y.PD Firearms Division and police precinct are not suable entities); *Wingate v. City of New York*, No. 08 Civ. 217(ARR), 2008 WL 203313, at *2 (E.D. N.Y. Jan. 23, 2008) (police precinct is not a suable entity).

Accordingly, plaintiff's claims against the Precinct are dismissed.

B. Defendant Islamic Cultural Center

Pursuant to our authority to dismiss a complaint sua sponte, we find that plaintiff's claims against the Islamic Cultural Center ("Center") fail to meet the pleading requirements of Rule 8. See *Fitzgerald*, 221 F.3d at 364. Other than stating that he was arrested in 2008 "in an attempt to make a short cut[] through the [Center's] yard," (Compl. at 3), plaintiff fails to make any allegations against the Center. As currently alleged, the complaint fails to assert that the Center was acting under color of state law. Likewise, plaintiff fails to allege that the Center engaged in conduct that deprived plaintiff of his constitutional rights. Thus, we dismiss plaintiff's claims against the Center.

C. Defendant Lawrence D. Gerzog, Esq. and Defendant Maria G. Worley, Esq.

*8 According to plaintiff, defendants Lawrence D. Gerzog, Esq. ("Gerzog") and Defendant Maria G. Worley, Esq. ("Worley"), were lawyers who were appointed to represent him in one or more of the state criminal cases against him. Plaintiff contends that Gerzog and Worley requested unnecessary adjournments of those cases and that those adjournments resulted in the violation of his rights under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. (Compl. at 3–4.)

To state a claim for relief under § 1983, plaintiff must allege that Gerzog and Worley acted under color of state law and that their conduct resulted in a constitutional violation. Here, however, plaintiff does not allege that either Gerzog or Worley were acting under color of state law. See *Dennis*, 449 U.S. at 27–28 (1990).

Moreover, plaintiff's allegations that Gerzog and Worley sought unnecessary adjournments do not rise to the level of a constitutional violation. Assuming plaintiff intended to allege that Gerzog and Worley provided ineffective

assistance of counsel, plaintiff must satisfy a two-part test. First, plaintiff must allege that a lawyer's performance "fell below an objective standard of reasonableness." *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 688, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 2064, 80 L.Ed.2d 674, 693 (1984). Second, he must allege that there is a reasonable probability that but for counsel's error, the outcome of the proceeding in which the constitutionally deficient representation occurred would have been different. See *id.* at 694–95. Plaintiff's allegations fall far short of doing that.

Thus, because plaintiff's complaint fails to state a plausible claim for relief against Gerzog and Worley, we dismiss plaintiff's claims against them.

D. Defendant Carlos Fortunato

Plaintiff's sole allegation against defendant Carlos Fortunato ("Fortunato") is that "Carlos Fortunato's father, Mario Fortunato were both responsible for the stolen pictures. They stole them from plaintiff's place of residence."⁹ (Compl. at 5.) Again, plaintiff fails to adequately allege that Simmons was acting under color of state law. Moreover, the complaint fails to include "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief," *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555, and therefore plaintiff fails to give Fortunato fair notice as required under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

⁹ Plaintiff's complaint does not place this allegation in context. However, earlier in the complaint, plaintiff alleges that "[p]laintiff's young (19) year old pen-pal's pictures, phone number and addresses were stolen (in the month of August 2003)." (Compl. at 4.) Assuming that plaintiff is alleging that Fortunato stole photographs in 2003, and assuming that plaintiff could allege that Fortunato was acting under color of state law (which he does not), plaintiff's claims against Fortunato would be time-barred.

Accordingly, we dismiss plaintiff's claims against Fortunato.

E. Defendant African Islamic Mission

Plaintiff's complaint includes three sentences pertaining to the African Islamic Mission ("Mission"), none of which gives fair notice to the Mission about the nature of the claim and the grounds upon which the claim rests. (Compl. at 4 ("Plaintiff was informed two (2) years ago, about a family member, from the African Islamic Mission, had been serving State time,

around the exact time as plaintiff and also was informed that this once Orthodox Muslim group, are Blood gang-members. Plaintiff joined the African Islamic Mission, in the month of 1994. Yet, left on bad terms about four (4) months later.”.) If plaintiff’s claims relate to events in 1994, they are plainly time-bared. However, even assuming that plaintiff’s claims against the Mission were timely filed, plaintiff neither alleges that the Mission acted under color of state law nor does he allege a plausible constitutional violation by the Mission.

*9 Because plaintiff does not include any substantive allegations concerning the Mission, we find that plaintiff’s claims against the African Islamic Mission fail to meet the pleading requirements of [Rule 8](#).

IV. State Law Claims

It is unclear whether plaintiff seeks to assert state tort law claims. Indeed, in his oppositions papers, plaintiff states that he is simply filing a civil rights action pursuant to [§ 1983](#). However, to the extent that plaintiff did intend to assert state tort claims, defendants argue that these must be dismissed due to the plaintiff’s failure to comply with New York’s notice of claim requirement.

[Sections 50–e and 50–i of New York’s General Municipal Law](#) require that a plaintiff asserting state tort law claims against a municipal entity or its employees acting in the scope of employment must: (1) file a notice of claim within ninety days of the incident giving rise to the claim; and (2) commence a lawsuit within a year and ninety days from the date on which the cause of action accrues. Additionally, a plaintiff must allege in his complaint or in his moving papers that a notice of claim has been served, that at least thirty days elapsed between the filing of the notice of claim and the filing of the complaint, and that the defendant has either neglected or refused to satisfy the claim. See [N.Y. Gen. Mun. Law § 50–i\(1\)\(b\)](#); see also [Arum v. Miller](#), 304 F.Supp.2d 344, 348 (S.D.N.Y.2003).

State notice of claim requirements apply to state law claims regardless of whether those claims were brought in state or federal court. [Felder v. Casey](#), 487 U.S. 131, 151, 108 S.Ct. 2302, 2313, 101 L.Ed.2d 123, 146 (1988); [Hardy v. New York City Health & Hosps. Corp.](#), 164 F.3d 789, 793 (2d Cir.1999). Notice of claim requirements “are construed strictly by New York state courts,” [AT & T v. New York City Dep’t of Human Res.](#), 736 F.Supp. 496, 499 (S.D.N.Y.1990), and “apply with equal force to actions prosecuted by *pro se* plaintiffs,” [McNeil v. Aguilos](#), 831 F.Supp. 1079, 1085 (S.D.N.Y.1993). Failure

to comply with these requirements may result in a dismissal for failure to state a cause of action. [Brown v. Metro. Transp. Auth.](#), 717 F.Supp. 257, 259 (S.D.N.Y.1989).

Here, plaintiff filed a notice of claim in October 2009.¹⁰ That notice of claim was plainly filed more than ninety days after the October 27, 2008 arrest and the February 23, 2009 indictment. Thus, if plaintiff intended to assert a state law claim for wrongful arrest, we would be obliged to dismiss such a claim in light of plaintiff’s failure to file a timely notice of claim.

¹⁰ In his complaint, plaintiff alleges that his notice of claim has “[b]een on file since Nov. 12th, 2009.” (Compl. at 8.) However, in its opposition, the DOC attaches a copy of plaintiff’s notice of claim, which appears to have been filed on October 9, 2009.

Unlike a possible claim for wrongful arrest, which is untimely on its face, the burglary prosecution apparently continued into 2010. Thus, if plaintiff intended to assert a state law claim for malicious prosecution, we assume, for the sake of argument only, that the October 2009 notice of claim was timely filed.

To assert a state law claim for malicious prosecution, plaintiff must allege: “(1) the initiation of a proceeding, (2) its termination favorably to the plaintiff, (3) lack of probable cause, and (4) malice.” [Colon v. City of New York](#), 60 N.Y.2d 78, 82 (1983); see also [Savino v. City of New York](#), 331 F.3d 63, 72–73 (2d Cir.2003). A grand jury’s indictment creates a “presumption of probable cause” that “may be overcome only by evidence establishing that police witnesses have not made a complete and full statement of facts either to the Grand Jury or to the District Attorney, that they have misrepresented or falsified evidence, that they have withheld evidence or otherwise acted in bad faith.” [Colon](#), 60 N.Y.2d at 82–83; see also [Navarez v. City of New York](#), 2011 N.Y. Slip. Op. 2961, at *1, 922 N.Y.S.2d 12 (1st Dep’t Apr. 14, 2011).

*10 Here, plaintiff alleges that the October 2008 arrest for trespassing resulted in a guilty plea. In light of this allegation, plaintiff cannot also allege, as required, that the trespass proceeding terminated favorably to him. See [Bennett v. New York City Hous. Auth.](#), 245 A.D.2d 254, 254, 665 N.Y.S.2d 91, 92 (2d Dep’t 1997) (holding that guilty plea “conclusively established probable cause for [the] arrest, thus negating an essential element of his cause of action sounding in malicious prosecution ...”). Additionally, plaintiff alleges that he was

2011 WL 2565476

indicted by a grand jury in connection with the February 2009 burglary charge, which gives rise to a presumption of probable cause. Because plaintiff does not allege facts to rebut that presumption, he fails to state a state law claim for malicious prosecution with respect to the burglary charge.

Finally, “district courts may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over a claim if the district court has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction.” 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). Consequently, “where the federal claims are dismissed before trial, the state claims should be dismissed as well.” *Marcus v. AT & T Corp.*, 138 F.3d 46, 57 (2d Cir.1998). Having dismissed plaintiff’s § 1983 claims, this Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any remaining state law claims, which are dismissed without prejudice.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the motions to dismiss (docket nos. 7, 19, 20, and 26) are granted. Leave to amend is granted only to the extent that plaintiff has additional evidence to support a plausible claim for a violation of his First Amendment rights. Any amendment shall be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of this Memorandum and Order.

The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. See *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444–45, 82 S.Ct. 917, 8 L.Ed.2d 21 (1962).

All Citations

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2011 WL 2565476

End of Document

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

2018 WL 2926272

2018 WL 2926272

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.
United States District Court, N.D. New York.

Tyrone MATTHEWS, Plaintiff,

v.

COUNTY OF CAYUGA, et al., Defendants.

5:17-CV-1004 (MAD/TWD)

|

Signed 06/08/2018

Attorneys and Law Firms

OFFICE OF JARROD W. SMITH, OF COUNSEL: [JARROD W. SMITH](#), ESQ., 11 South Main Street, P.O. Box 173, Jordan, New York 13080, Attorney for Plaintiff.

ORDER

[Mae A. D'Agostino](#), U.S. District Judge

*1 On September 8, 2017, Plaintiff Tyrone Matthews commenced a counseled civil rights action, pursuant to [42 U.S.C. § 1983](#), against Defendants County of Cayuga, Cayuga County Sheriff's Department, Cayuga County District Attorney's Office, Cayuga County District Attorney Jon E. Budelmann, Cayuga County Senior Assistant District Attorney Christopher Valdina, City of Auburn, and Auburn City Police Department. *See* Dkt. No. 1. In addition, Plaintiff filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. *See* Dkt. No. 2.

On November 27, 2017, Magistrate Judge Thérèse Wiley Dancks issued an Order and Report-Recommendation in which she granted Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. *See* Dkt. No. 6. Magistrate Judge Dancks also conducted an initial review of the complaint and recommended dismissal of all claims. *See id.* This recommendation was rejected as moot because Plaintiff amended his original complaint as matter of right. *See* Dkt. No. 15.

In the Amended Complaint, filed on March 2, 2018, Plaintiff named as additional defendants the following law enforcement officers: Jeffrey Catalfano, Matthew Androsko, David Edmonds, Andrew Penczek, Andrew Skardinski, Timothy Spingler, and David Walters, and the Chief of the

Auburn Police Department, Shawn I. Butler. *See* Dkt. No. 13 at ¶¶ 15-22.

In his Amended Complaint, Plaintiff asserts the following causes of action pursuant to [42 U.S.C. § 1983](#) and New York State law: "malicious prosecution; conspiracy to commit malicious prosecution; false arrest; intentional infliction of emotional distress; deliberately indifferent unconstitutional decisions, policies, practice[s], habits, customs, usages, training and derelict supervision, ratification, acquiescence and intentional failures[.]" Dkt. No. 13 at ¶ 27. These claims stem from two separate indictments.

In an indictment dated September 23, 2015, Plaintiff was charged with two counts of Criminal Sale of a Controlled Substance in the Third Degree, two counts of Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance in the Third Degree, and two counts of Criminal Possession of a Controlled in the Seventh Degree. *See id.* at ¶ 28. On September 30, 2015, Plaintiff was arraigned on these charges and, unable to post bail, was housed at the Cayuga County Jail. *See id.* at ¶ 29. In an indictment dated July 7, 2016, Plaintiff was charged with one count of Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance in the Third Degree. *See id.* at ¶ 30.

Plaintiff claims that Defendants lacked probable cause to arrest and prosecute him for the felony drug charges because they knew that "Plaintiff was a drug addict and nothing more than an agent of a drug dealer." *Id.* at ¶ 31. At trial, Plaintiff was convicted of three counts of Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance in the Seventh Degree but was acquitted of the remaining, more serious counts.

On April 18, 2018, Magistrate Judge Dancks issued a second Order and Report-Recommendation based on Plaintiff's Amended Complaint in which she recommended the complaint be dismissed upon initial review under [28 U.S.C. § 1915\(e\)\(2\)\(B\)\(ii\)-\(iii\)](#). *See* Dkt. No. 16. Magistrate Judge Dancks further recommended that Plaintiff's [§ 1983](#) claims be dismissed without prejudice as barred by *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994); and that Plaintiff's [§ 1983](#) claims against Defendants Budelmann and Valdina be dismissed with prejudice on prosecutorial immunity grounds. *See id.* In addition, Magistrate Judge Dancks recommended that the Court decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims, and that Plaintiff's letter motion (Dkt. No. 14) be denied as moot. *See id.*

2018 WL 2926272

*2 A court may grant a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) if the party is “unable to pay” the standard fee for commencing an action. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1). When a plaintiff seeks to proceed IFP, “the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that ... the action or appeal (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). While “extreme caution should be used in considering an *in forma pauperis* application, ... there is a responsibility on the court to determine that a claim has some arguable basis in law before permitting a plaintiff to proceed with an action *in forma pauperis*.” *Moreman v. Douglas*, 848 F. Supp. 332, 333–34 (N.D.N.Y. 1994) (internal citations omitted); see, e.g., *Thomas v. Scully*, 943 F.2d 259, 260 (2d Cir. 1991) (per curiam) (holding that a district court has the power to dismiss a complaint *sua sponte* if the complaint is frivolous).

To survive dismissal for failure to state a claim, a party need only present a claim that is “plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citation omitted). While Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which sets forth the general rules of pleading, “does not require detailed factual allegations, ... it demands more than an unadorned” recitation of the alleged misconduct. *Id.* (citations and quotation omitted). In determining whether a complaint states a claim upon which relief may be granted, “the court must accept the material facts alleged in the complaint as true and construe all reasonable inferences in the plaintiff’s favor.” *Hernandez v. Coughlin*, 18 F.3d 133, 136 (2d Cir. 1994) (citation omitted). However, “the tenet that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. “Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Id.* (citation omitted).

When a party files specific objections to a magistrate judge’s order and report-recommendation, the district court “make[s] a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, “[g]eneral or conclusory objections, or objections which merely recite the same arguments presented to the

magistrate judge are reviewed for clear error.” *O’Diah v. Mawhir*, No. 9:08-CV-322, 2011 WL 933846, *2 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 16, 2011) (citations and footnote omitted). After the appropriate review, “the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A litigant’s failure to file objections to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation waives any challenge to the report on appeal. See *Cephas v. Nash*, 328 F.3d 98, 107 (2d Cir. 2003) (holding that, “[a]s a rule, a party’s failure to object to any purported error or omission in a magistrate judge’s report waives further judicial review of the point” (citation omitted)).

In the present matter, Magistrate Judge Dancks provided Plaintiff adequate notice that he was required to file any objections to the Order and Report-Recommendation, and specifically informed him that failure to object to any portion of the report would preclude his right to appellate review. See Dkt. No. 16 at 13. On May 15, 2018, Plaintiff’s counsel filed a letter stating he “will not be filing any objections.” See Dkt. No. 19.

*3 As Magistrate Judge Dancks correctly found, Plaintiff is barred under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), to assert civil rights claims, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, for false arrest, false imprisonment, conspiracy, and malicious prosecution. Under *Heck* and its progeny, a “§ 1983 action is barred (absent prior invalidation)—no matter the relief sought (damages or equitable relief), no matter the target of the [plaintiff’s] suit (state conduct leading to conviction or internal prison proceedings)—if success in that action would necessarily demonstrate the invalidity of confinement or its duration.” See *Wilkinson v. Dotson*, 544 U.S. 74, 81-82 (2005) (emphasis omitted). In this case, Plaintiff was convicted of three counts of Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance in the Seventh Degree. Plaintiff’s success here would unquestionably cast doubt on these counts. Therefore, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s claims for false arrest, false imprisonment, conspiracy, and malicious prosecution are barred under *Heck*. See *DiBlasio v. City of New York*, 102 F.3d 654, 657-59 (2d Cir. 1996).

As Magistrate Judge Dancks correctly concluded, a prosecutor is absolutely immune from liability for virtually all acts associated with his or her function as a prosecutor and advocate. See *Lawlor v. Connelly*, 471 Fed. Appx. 64, 65 (2d Cir. 2012) (citing cases). In fact, the Second Circuit has specifically held that a prosecutor is absolutely immune from

2018 WL 2926272

liability for withholding exculpatory evidence from a grand jury. *See Hill v. City of New York*, 45 F.3d 653, 661 (2d Cir. 1995). Therefore, the Court finds that Plaintiff's § 1983 claims against Budelmann and Valdina are dismissed with prejudice on prosecutorial immunity grounds.

Further, since Plaintiff's § 1983 claims are dismissed, the Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state claims. *See Kolari v. New York Presbyterian Hosp.*, 445 F.3d 118, 120 (2d Cir. 2006) (holding that the district court has discretion to decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims because all claims over which the federal court has original jurisdiction have been dismissed).

Upon a review of the Order and Report-Recommendation, and considering that Plaintiff has not objected to any of Magistrate Judge Dancks' thorough and well-reasoned recommendations, the Court finds no clear error in Magistrate Judge Dancks' recommendations and hereby affirms and

adopts the Order and Report-Recommendation as the opinion of the Court.

Accordingly, the Court hereby

ORDERS that Magistrate Judge Dancks' April 18, 2018 Order and Report-Recommendation is **ADOPTED in its entirety**; and the Court further

ORDERS that Plaintiff's amended complaint (Dkt. No. 13) is **DISMISSED** on initial review pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)-(iii); and the Court further

ORDERS that the Clerk of the Court shall serve a copy of this Order on all parties in accordance with the Local Rules.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

All Citations

Not Reported in Fed. Supp., 2018 WL 2926272

End of Document

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

2022 WL 992885

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, S.D. New York.

Benjamin Samuel RICH, formerly
known as Samuel Guillaume, Plaintiff,

v.

State of NEW YORK, New York City; New
York City Police Department; New York County;
New York County District Attorney's Office;
Detective Michael Miller, Vincent Corrado, John
Passement, Cyrus Vance, Jr., Shipla Kalra, David
Nasar, and Does 1–100, Inclusive., Defendants.

21 Civ. 3835 (AT)

|

Signed 03/31/2022

Attorneys and Law Firms

Benjamin Samuel Rich, Staten Island, NY, Pro Se.

Gee Won Cha, [Julinda A. Dawkins](#), New York State Office
of the Attorney General, New York, NY, for Defendant State
of New York.Andrew B. Spears, New York City Law Department, New
York, NY, for Defendants City New York, Michael Miller,
Vincent Corrado, John Passement.[Patricia Jean Bailey](#), New York County District Attorney's
Office, New York, NY, for Defendants [Cyrus Vance, Jr.](#),
David Nasar.**ORDER**[ANALISA TORRES](#), District Judge:

*1 This action arises from a 2016 arrest and prosecution of Plaintiff *pro se*, Benjamin Samuel Rich, in New York County. He brings claims against the State of New York (the “State”); former New York County District Attorney (“DA”) Cyrus R. Vance, Jr. and two Assistant District Attorneys (“ADAs”), Shipla Kalra and David Nasar, (collectively, the “DA Defendants”); and the City of New York (the “City”), the New York City Police Department (the “NYPD”), and NYPD officers Michael Miller, Vincent Corrado, and John Passement (collectively, the “City Defendants”), pursuant to,

inter alia, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, and 1986, the New York State Constitution, and New York common law. *See generally* Compl., ECF No. 1. Before the Court are three motions to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to [Rules 12\(b\)\(1\) and 12\(b\)\(6\) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure](#), brought by the State, ECF No. 20, the DA Defendants, ECF No. 22, and the City Defendants, ECF No. 32.

For the reasons stated below, the State's motion to dismiss is GRANTED, and Plaintiff's claims against the State are DISMISSED. The DA Defendants' motion to dismiss is GRANTED—Plaintiff's claims against Vance are DISMISSED; and his claims against Kalra and Nasar are DISMISSED except for Counts 3 and 4, which are DISMISSED without prejudice to renewal in an amended complaint. The City Defendants' motion to dismiss is DENIED as to Count 4, and GRANTED in all other respects. Plaintiff's claims against Passamenti, the NYPD, and the City are DISMISSED; and his claims against Miller and Corrado are DISMISSED, except for Count 3, which is DISMISSED without prejudice to renewal in an amended complaint.

BACKGROUND¹

¹ Unless otherwise stated, the following facts are taken from the complaint and assumed, for purposes of this motion, to be true. *ATSI Commc'ns, Inc. v. Shaar Fund, Ltd.*, 493 F.3d 87, 98 (2d Cir. 2007).

On January 6, 2016, Plaintiff was at the Highline Ballroom (“the Highline”), a nightclub in Manhattan, as an invited guest of Wasief Quahtan, a Highline employee. Compl. ¶ 24. Quahtan and the club owner began arguing over “Quahtan[’s] [having brought] Plaintiff to the party.” *Id.* ¶ 25. Security staff, and an individual named Avery Jackson, asked Plaintiff to leave. *Id.* ¶ 26. Plaintiff alleges that he was “forcibly escorted” from the club, and that Jackson became “belligerent and aggressive” towards him. *Id.* ¶ 27. Shortly thereafter, a shooting occurred outside the Highline. *Id.* ¶ 28.

Plaintiff believes that Jackson “ran down the street and jumped into a black sedan ... at the time the shots were fired.” *Id.* ¶ 37. He also states that there were “numerous witnesses” to the shooting, including a “female 911 caller,” who lived “next door” to the Highline. *Id.* ¶ 36. In that 911 call, the witness said that she had seen a “man jump into a black sedan speeding down the street” after shots were fired. *Id.* Based

on this call, Plaintiff believes “it was more likely that it was [] Jackson who fired the shots before jumping into the black sedan to chase Plaintiff down.” *Id.* ¶ 37.

*2 The shooting was investigated by Detective Michael Miller, who interviewed Jackson. *Id.* ¶¶ 29–30. Jackson told Miller that he saw Plaintiff go to a car, “pull out a gun, and shoot in the direction of the Highline,” and that Jackson “ran back into the club” when shots were fired. *Id.* ¶¶ 30, 37. But, Plaintiff alleges that many of Jackson’s representations to Miller contradicted his initial statements to the NYPD officers who first responded to the shooting, as well as other eyewitness accounts. *See, e.g.*, ¶¶ 30–32. For instance, Plaintiff alleges that Jackson told the responding officers that Plaintiff was “escorted from the club because he was intoxicated,” and that Plaintiff then “went to his car, [a Rolls Royce] removed a firearm ... and fired several shots.” *Id.* ¶¶ 31, 46. But, Jackson told Miller that Plaintiff was “forcibly ejected from the club” after an altercation with its manager, that Plaintiff was “belligerent,” and threatened that he had a gun. *Id.* ¶ 32. Plaintiff also contends that Jackson’s statements were demonstrably false, because surveillance videos showed that Jackson “was the aggressor towards Plaintiff,” and that Plaintiff was “calm, peaceful, and cooperative” when escorted from the club. *Id.* ¶¶ 32, 41.

Plaintiff alleges that Miller failed to conduct a thorough and complete investigation of the shooting, because he did not interview several witnesses, including the 911 caller. *Id.* ¶¶ 36–37, 39. Plaintiff also suggests that Miller obtained—but disregarded—surveillance video from the inside and the outside of the club that would have corroborated Plaintiff’s version of events. *See id.* ¶¶ 40–43. Plaintiff also complains that Officer Vincent Corrado, Miller’s supervisor, “approved all [of the] reports written” in the investigation and “should have notice[d] or known of all the inconsistencies and contradictory statements” in Miller’s reports. *Id.* ¶ 95. And, Plaintiff alleges that Officer John Passementi “authorized DNA tests,” which revealed that the DNA evidence recovered at the scene “did not match Plaintiff.” *Id.* ¶ 96.

On January 9, 2016, Miller obtained a search warrant for Plaintiff’s car, based on what Plaintiff contends were “false, misleading and/or embellished information” in the underlying affidavits. *Id.* ¶ 46. The next day, Jackson picked Plaintiff’s mugshot out of a photo lineup. *Id.* ¶ 92. Plaintiff appears to argue that this lineup was unduly suggestive, because his “mugshot had a lighter background than the other photographs.” *Id.* ¶ 92. The same day, Miller obtained a

warrant for Plaintiff’s arrest for attempted murder, assault, and weapons possession, and in February obtained additional search warrants for Plaintiff’s cell phone and laptop, allegedly based, again, on false and misleading statements provided by Miller and Jackson. *Id.* ¶¶ 45, 47. According to Plaintiff, no “physical evidence [] tie[d] him to any part of the shooting,” *id.* ¶ 81, and the police did not recover a gun or find gunshot residue in Plaintiff’s car, *id.* ¶ 91.

On January 22, 2016, a grand jury indicted Plaintiff for second-degree attempted murder, first-degree assault, and two counts of criminal possession of a weapon. *See id.* ¶¶ 45, 51. On January 27, 2016, Plaintiff was arrested. *Id.* ¶ 51. He was incarcerated until February 18, 2016, when he was released on bail. *Id.* ¶ 52.

In November 2016, Plaintiff was taken back into custody on suspicion of witness tampering, after Jackson allegedly made a “false[]” report to the DA’s Office that Plaintiff had tried to contact him. *Id.* ¶¶ 53, 103. Plaintiff remained in jail until his trial, which began in June 2017. *Id.* ¶¶ 54, 64; *see also* Trial Tr. at 1, ECF No. 22-3.²

2 The relevant state court trial transcripts were submitted by the DA Defendants in their motion to dismiss. *See* Trial Tr.; Dismissal Tr., ECF No. 22-4. The Court may take judicial notice of these transcripts as a matter of public record. *See Shmueli v. City of N.Y.*, 424 F.3d 231, 233 (2d Cir. 2005).

On March 26, 2016, ADAs Shilpa Kalra and David Nasar provided surveillance videos from the Highline to Plaintiff’s counsel. Compl. ¶ 64. Plaintiff alleges, however, that the relevant video showed only “one (1) camera angle [out] of 14 camera angles.” *Id.* He alleges that prosecutors did not provide videos from the thirteen additional camera angles until a week after trial commenced, even though these videos were collected from the Highline eighteen months earlier. Compl. ¶ 64. The trial court accordingly granted counsel’s request to review the additional videos before conducting Jackson’s cross-examination. Trial Tr. at 3. On direct examination, Jackson testified that he did not participate in escorting Plaintiff out of the club. *Id.* at 47–48.

*3 On June 12, 2017, prior to Jackson’s cross-examination, Plaintiff’s counsel reported to the trial court that Jackson could be identified in the additional videos based on his clothing. *Id.* at 135. Nasar acknowledged that if Jackson was indeed visible in the videos, he was “doing a bunch of things contrary to

what he testified about.” *Id.*; *see also id.* at 136. The trial court then determined that Jackson should be questioned, under oath, outside the jury’s presence, about his clothing on the night in question, and whether he could identify himself on the videos, among other matters. *See id.* at 146–50, 152–54. Jackson was brought in, and warned about perjury. *See id.* at 154–56. Jackson identified himself on the videos wearing a jacket and a light-colored shirt. *See id.* at 156–59. The court then adjourned the proceedings. *See id.* at 159. When the court resumed, Jackson, through counsel, invoked his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination, *id.* at 176, and the court declared a mistrial, *id.* at 186–88.

Plaintiff’s counsel then moved to dismiss the indictment against Plaintiff on two grounds: first, that it was based on false testimony, and second, because of prosecutorial misconduct. Compl. ¶ 100. On October 17, 2017, Kalra consented to dismissal of the indictment on the first ground, but opposed the assertion of prosecutorial misconduct. Dismissal Tr. at 12–13, 15–16. The court dismissed the indictment, but the presiding judge stated he did not “see any prosecutorial misconduct.” *Id.* at 16.

On March 12, 2021, over three years after the indictment was dismissed, Plaintiff commenced this action. Compl. Defendants move separately to dismiss the claims against them. ECF Nos. 20, 22, 32. The Court considers each motion in turn.

DISCUSSION

I. Legal Standard

A. Rule 12(b)(1)

An action should be dismissed pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) where it is apparent that the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction—that is, the statutory or constitutional power—to adjudicate it. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1)*; *Thomas v. Metro. Corr. Ctr.*, No. 09 Civ. 1769, 2010 WL 2507041, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. June 21, 2010). “A plaintiff asserting subject matter jurisdiction has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that it exists.” *Makarova v. United States*, 201 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir. 2000). A district court must consider a challenge to subject matter jurisdiction before addressing other grounds for dismissal. *Rhulen Agency, Inc. v. Ala. Ins. Guar. Ass’n*, 896 F.2d 674, 678 (2d Cir. 1990).

On a Rule 12(b)(1) motion, the Court must accept all material factual allegations as true. *J.S. ex rel. N.S. v. Attica Cent. Schs.*, 386 F.3d 107, 110 (2d Cir. 2004). It may not, however, “draw inferences ... favorable to [the] plaintiff[]” on such a motion. *Id.* And, the Court may consider evidence outside the pleadings to resolve disputed factual issues relating to jurisdiction. *See id.*

B. Rule 12(b)(6)

To survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss, “a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter ... to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’ ” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A plaintiff is not required to provide “detailed factual allegations” in the complaint, but must assert “more than labels and conclusions.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. The court must accept the allegations in the complaint as true and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff. *ATSI Commc’ns, Inc.*, 493 F.3d at 98. On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court may consider only the complaint, documents attached to the complaint, matters of which a court can take judicial notice, or documents that the plaintiff knew about and relied upon. *See Chambers v. Time Warner, Inc.*, 282 F.3d 147, 153 (2d Cir. 2002).

Additionally, because Plaintiff proceeds *pro se*, the Court is obligated to construe his submissions “liberally and interpret[] [them] to raise the strongest arguments they suggest.” *Triestman v. Fed. Bur. of Prisons*, 470 F.3d 471, 474 (2d Cir. 2006) (citation omitted). And, on a motion to dismiss, the Court may appropriately consider a *pro se* plaintiff’s opposition papers to “supplement or clarify” the allegations in their complaint. *Sommersett v. City of N.Y.*, No. 09 Civ. 5916, 2011 WL 2565301, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. June 28, 2011) (citation omitted).

II. Duplicative and Improper Claims

*4 Count 7 of the complaint asserts a claim under 18 U.S.C. § 245 for the deprivation of rights under the color of law. Compl. ¶¶ 148–51. But, no private right of action exists under this federal criminal statute, and accordingly, Plaintiff cannot raise a cognizable claim under it. *See Corrado v. State of N.Y. Univ. Stony Brook Police*, No. 15 Civ. 7443, 2016 WL 4179946, at *3 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 5, 2016). Count 7 is, accordingly, DISMISSED with prejudice.

Further, the Court finds that Count 9 of the complaint—fraudulent misrepresentation under § 1983, Compl. ¶¶ 157–

63—is duplicative of Count 4—deprivation of a fair trial under § 1983, *id.* ¶¶ 133–37—because both seek redress for violations of Plaintiff’s liberty interests arising from the alleged “fabrication of evidence by a government officer.” See *Zahrey v. Coffey*, 221 F.3d 342, 349–50 (2d Cir. 2000). Count 9 is, accordingly, DISMISSED with prejudice.

Finally, three of Plaintiff’s claims—Counts 4, 5, and 6—include both federal constitutional claims and analogous state constitutional claims. Compl. ¶¶ 133–47. The New York State Constitution “provides a private right of action where remedies are otherwise unavailable at common law or under § 1983.” *Allen v. Antal*, 665 F. App’x 9, 13 (2d Cir. 2016). But, where alternative remedies are available under the federal civil rights statutes, including § 1983, courts must dismiss the plaintiff’s state constitutional claims. *Id.* Because § 1983 provides a remedy for all of Plaintiff’s alleged federal constitutional violations, any analogous state constitutional claims are duplicative. Accordingly, the state constitutional claims pleaded in Counts 4, 5, and 6 are DISMISSED with prejudice.

III. The State’s Motion

The State moves to dismiss the complaint under Rule 12(b)(1), on the ground that the Eleventh Amendment bars Plaintiff’s claims against it by virtue of sovereign immunity. State Mem. at 3, ECF No. 21. The Court agrees.

The Eleventh Amendment bars federal courts from exercising jurisdiction over claims against states. U.S. CONST. AMEND. XI. This extends to a state sued by its own citizens, see *Kimel v. Fla. Bd. of Regents*, 528 U.S. 62, 72–73 (2000), and state agencies, see *Welch v. Texas Dep’t of Highways & Pub. Transp.*, 483 U.S. 468, 480 (1987). There are only limited exceptions to this rule, none of which are applicable here.

First, a state may waive its Eleventh Amendment defense. See *Coll. Sav. Bank v. Fla. Prepaid Postsec. Educ. Expense Bd.*, 527 U.S. 666, 670 (1999). Here, the State has not explicitly waived its immunity, or consented to be sued. See State Mem. at 3. And, by filing a motion to dismiss, rather than an answer to the complaint, the State cannot be said to have taken actions inconsistent with an assertion of immunity. Cf. *Lapides v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. Sys. of Ga.*, 535 U.S. 613, 619 (2002) (finding waiver of immunity where state removed action to federal court, then asserted immunity).

Second, Congress may abrogate the states’ immunity from suit through statute. *Kimel*, 528 U.S. at 80. But, Congress has not done so for claims brought under § 1983, *Dube v. State Univ. of N.Y.*, 900 F.2d 587, 594 (2d Cir. 1990), § 1985, see *Robinson v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 508 F. App’x 7, 9 (2d Cir. 2013), or § 1986, *Medina v. Cuomo*, No. 15 Civ. 1283, 2015 WL 13744627, at *6–7 (N.D.N.Y. Nov. 9, 2015). In the “absence of [the State’s] consent,” accordingly, such claims are “proscribed by the Eleventh Amendment.” *Pennhurst St. Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984); see also *Trotman v. Palisades Interstate Park Comm’n*, 557 F.2d 35, 40 (2d Cir. 1977).

*5 Finally, the Eleventh Amendment does not bar a “suit against a state official when that suit seeks prospective injunctive relief.” *Seminole Tribe of Fla. v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44, 73 (1996); see also *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908). But here, Plaintiff seeks only money damages, and retrospective declaratory and equitable relief. Compl. § IX. And, Eleventh Amendment immunity shields states from claims for money damages, *Liner v. Hochul*, No. 21 Civ. 11116, 2022 WL 826342, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 17, 2022), and “declaratory relief dealing solely with past violations,” *Medina*, 2015 WL 13744627, at *7. Although Plaintiff demands “affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of Defendants’ unlawful practices,” see Compl. § IX(B), he does not allege any present violations of his rights, see *id.* See *Medina*, 2015 WL 13744627, at *7 (noting that “declaratory relief where there is no present violation, is also barred under the Eleventh Amendment”). Accordingly, this exception does not preclude the State’s immunity defense in this matter.

Where a defendant is found to have sovereign immunity from suit, the Court is deprived of subject-matter jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1). *McGinty v. New York*, 251 F.3d 84, 89, 101 (2d Cir. 2001). Accordingly, because the State is immune from liability on all of Plaintiff’s claims under the Eleventh Amendment, its motion to dismiss is GRANTED. And, because amendment would be futile, Plaintiff’s claims against the State are DISMISSED with prejudice to renewal.³

³ Because the Court concludes that it lacks jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims against the State under Rule 12(b)(1), it need not reach the State’s alternative ground for dismissal, that Plaintiff’s § 1983 and § 1985 claims must be dismissed because the State is not a suable “person” within the meaning of those statutes. State Mem. at 3–4.

IV. The DA Defendants' Motion

Plaintiff raises claims against the DA Defendants “in their individual capacities”⁴ arising *inter alia* under § 1983, § 1985, and § 1986,⁵ based on three main factual assertions. *See generally* Compl. First, Plaintiff alleges that Kalra and Nasar wrongfully chose to prosecute him, despite the lack of physical evidence tying him to the shooting. Compl. ¶ 81. Second, Plaintiff asserts that Kalra and Nasar intentionally withheld exculpatory surveillance videos until the middle of his trial, *see id.* ¶¶ 75–76, 78. Third, Plaintiff alleges that the “[p]rosecuting [a]ttorneys” “coached” Jackson to give false testimony to the grand jury that indicted him. *Id.* ¶¶ 50–51.

⁴ Plaintiff makes this clarification for the first time in his opposition papers. ECF No. 28 at 14. The Court notes that because, as discussed, the Eleventh Amendment bars suits against states, *see supra* at 8–10, when a defendant is sued in his official capacity, the court treats the suit as one against the “entity of which an officer is an agent.” *Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159, 165–66 (1985) (quoting *Monell v. N.Y.C. Dep’t of Soc. Services*, 436 U.S. 658, 690 n.55 (1978)). And, where a “district attorney or an assistant district attorney acts as a prosecutor, she is an agent of the State, and therefore immune from suit in her official capacity.” *D’Alessandro v. City of N.Y.*, 713 F. App’x 1, 8 (2d Cir. 2017). Accordingly, any claims Plaintiff may raise against the DA Defendants in their “official capacity” would be precluded by immunity under the Eleventh Amendment. *See id.*

⁵ Although Plaintiff asserts that he pleads each of his claims against “all Defendants,” even a liberal read of the complaint makes clear that certain of Plaintiff’s claims cannot implicate the DA Defendants’ conduct, including counts 1 (unreasonable search and seizure); 2 (false arrest/imprisonment); 11 (personal injury); 12 (property damage) and 13 (negligent hiring, training, supervision, and discipline of officers). Compl. ¶¶ 117–27, 168–81. As the Court has already dismissed Counts 7 and 9, *see supra* at 7–8, it only considers Counts 3 (malicious prosecution); 4 (deprivation of fair trial); 5 (conspiracy); 6 (failure to intervene); 8 (abuse of process); 10 (negligent misrepresentation); and 14 (negligent

infliction of emotional distress) against the DA Defendants.

A. Absolute Immunity

*6 The DA Defendants argue that Plaintiff’s claims are barred by absolute and qualified prosecutorial immunity. DA Defs. Mem. at 10–12, ECF No. 22-1. To the extent Plaintiff’s claims are predicated on his allegations that Kalra and Nasar wrongfully chose to prosecute him and withheld allegedly exculpatory evidence, the Court agrees.

1. Federal Claims

Although § 1983 has no immunities on its face, the Supreme Court has held that, when Congress initially enacted the statute, it did not intend to abrogate existing immunities established at common law. *See Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 418 (1976). Thus, both absolute and qualified immunity are applicable defenses to § 1983 claims. *See Bernard v. Cty. of Suffolk*, 356 F.3d 495, 502 (2d Cir. 2004). Prosecutors are entitled to “absolute immunity” from liability when they function as advocates for the state in circumstances “intimately associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process.” *Imbler*, 424 U.S. at 430. But, prosecutors are entitled only to “qualified immunity” when they perform “investigative functions” normally undertaken by a police officer. *Buckley v. Fitzsimmons*, 509 U.S. 259, 273 (1993). Under the doctrine of qualified immunity, an official is immune from liability “only when in light of clearly established law and the information the official possesses, it was objectively reasonable for him to think that his actions were lawful.” *Hill v. City of N.Y.*, 45 F.3d 653, 663 (2d Cir. 1995).

Courts employ a “functional approach” to determine the availability of absolute immunity, looking to “the nature of the function performed, not the identity of the actor who performed it.” *Buckley*, 509 U.S. at 269 (citations omitted). And, although the party claiming absolute immunity bears the burden of establishing its applicability, *see Doe v. Phillips*, 81 F.3d 1204, 1209 (2d Cir. 1996), if the court finds that the conduct at issue is covered by absolute immunity, then the actor is shielded from liability for damages no matter “how[] erroneous the act ... and how[] injurious ... its consequences.” *Cleavinger v. Saxner*, 474 U.S. 193, 199–200 (1985) (citation omitted); *see also Anilao v. Spota*, No. 19 Civ. 3949, 2022 WL 697663, at *4 (2d Cir. Mar. 9, 2022).

Plaintiff first alleges that Kalra and Nasar improperly chose to prosecute him, despite a lack of physical evidence tying him to the crime. Compl. ¶ 81. But, prosecutors are immune from suit for decisions regarding “whether and when to prosecute,” *Imbler*, 424 U.S. at 430–31 n.32–33, even where they may prosecute an innocent individual, *Schmueli*, 424 F.3d at 237–39. Kalra and Nasar are, therefore, entitled to absolute immunity to the extent Plaintiff’s claims are based on their decision to prosecute him.⁶

⁶ Because the Court finds that the DA Defendants are entitled to absolute immunity on any claims arising from the withholding of exculpatory evidence, the Court does not reach their alternative argument that Plaintiff fails to state a claim for an alleged *Brady* violation, see DA Defs. Mem. at 12–15.

Second, Plaintiff alleges that Kalra and Nasar intentionally withheld exculpatory surveillance videos until the middle of trial, Compl. ¶¶ 75–76, 78. But again, prosecutors are entitled to absolute immunity for all decisions taken “in their prosecutorial capacity, including decisions regarding which evidence should be disclosed to a criminal defendant.” *Newson v. City of N.Y.*, No. 16 Civ. 6773, 2019 WL 3997466, at *3 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 23, 2019). This is true even where information was deliberately withheld, *Ying Li v. City of New York*, 246 F. Supp. 3d 578, 640 (E.D.N.Y. 2017), or where such withholding violated the defendant’s constitutional rights, see *Warney v. Monroe Cnty.*, 587 F.3d 113, 125 (2d Cir. 2009). Accordingly, Kalra and Nasar have absolute immunity to the extent any of Plaintiff’s claims are predicated on a violation under this factual allegation.

*7 Finally, Plaintiff alleges that the “Prosecuting Attorneys” coached Jackson to give false testimony to the grand jury, which then formed the basis for his indictment. Compl. ¶¶ 50–51. Prosecutors generally only have qualified immunity for actions taken before there is probable cause to arrest a defendant, because they are performing an investigative function, rather than acting as advocates. See *Hill*, 45 F.3d at 661; *Buckley*, 509 U.S. at 273. And, although “knowingly presenting evidence” to a grand jury is considered the “core of a prosecutor’s role as an advocate,” *Bernard*, 356 F.3d at 503, the Second Circuit has distinguished between a prosecutor’s knowing presentation of false evidence to the grand jury—which is still entitled to absolute immunity—from a prosecutor’s deliberate fabrication of evidence, *Hill*, 45 F.3d at 662–63 (finding that where prosecutor deliberately manufactured evidence to establish probable

cause for plaintiff’s arrest, his conduct was investigatory, regardless of whether, when the evidence was manufactured, the prosecutor intended to present it to the grand jury). In *Hill*, the Second Circuit also established that “when it may not be gleaned from the complaint whether the conduct objected to was performed by the prosecutor in an advocacy or an investigatory role, the availability of qualified immunity from claims based on such conduct cannot be decided as a matter of law on a motion to dismiss.” *Id.* at 663.

As in *Hill*, Plaintiff alleges that the prosecutors deliberately participated in the fabrication of false evidence by coaching a material witness to give perjured testimony to the grand jury, so that the jury would return an indictment. Compl. ¶¶ 50–51. Allegations that the prosecution falsified evidence are distinct from allegations that the prosecution merely presented evidence they knew to be false. Compare *Hill*, 45 F.3d at 662–63, with *Urrego v. United States*, No. 00 Civ. 1203, 2005 WL 1263291, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. May 27, 2005) (prosecutors receive absolute immunity for claims predicated on “false presentation of evidence to a grand jury”). And, considering the Court’s obligation to liberally construe Plaintiff’s pleadings and afford every reasonable inference in his favor at this stage, the Court concludes the DA Defendants have not established that they were acting as “advocates,” rather than “investigators,” when they engaged in the challenged conduct. *Hill*, 45 F.3d at 660 (officials asserting absolute immunity bear the burden of establishing it for the action in question). And, accepting the facts in the complaint as true, the DA Defendants would not be entitled to even qualified immunity, because it is objectively unreasonable for them to have knowingly coached a witness to give false testimony before a grand jury. See *Cipolla v. Cty. of Rensselaer*, 129 F. Supp. 2d 436, 456 (N.D.N.Y. 2001) (not “objectively reasonable” to believe presenting or soliciting perjured testimony did not violate plaintiff’s clearly established rights). Accordingly, to the extent that Counts 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 are predicated on the claim that the DA Defendants coached Jackson to give false testimony, they are not entitled to either absolute or qualified immunity.

2. State Claims

Plaintiff raises state-law claims against the DA Defendants in Counts 10 and 14 of the complaint. Compl. ¶¶ 164–67, 182–85. As with federal law, under New York law, a district attorney prosecuting crime is performing a quasi-judicial function, and, as such, is entitled to absolute immunity.

Arteaga v. State, 72 N.Y.2d 212, 217 n.1 (N.Y. 1988). But, unlike federal law, prosecutors are absolutely immune for official acts in both the prosecution and investigation of criminal charges. See *Moore v. Dormin*, 173 Misc. 2d 836, 843, (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1997), *aff'd as modified*, 252 A.D.2d 421 (N.Y. App. Div. 1998). A prosecutor does not receive absolute immunity, however, “when knowingly acting in violation of law.” *Id.* As with Plaintiff’s federal claims, to the extent his state law claims against the DA Defendants are predicated on his allegations that they improperly targeted him for prosecution or deliberately withheld exculpatory evidence, the DA Defendants are entitled to absolute immunity. But, construing Plaintiff’s third allegation liberally, he essentially claims that the prosecutors knowingly acted in violation of the law by suborning perjury. The Court cannot conclude, therefore, that the DA Defendants are entitled to absolute immunity as a matter of state law to the extent Counts 10 and 14 rest on this allegation.⁷

⁷ As noted, the parallel state-law constitutional claims in Counts 4, 5, and 6 are dismissed with prejudice. See *supra* at 8.

B. Time Bar

*8 The DA Defendants argue that Plaintiff’s claims are untimely. DA Defs. Mem. at 6–8. With the exception of Counts 3 (§ 1983 malicious prosecution) and 4 (§ 1983 deprivation of a fair trial), the Court agrees.

1. Federal Claims

Claims arising under §§ 1983 and 1985, when brought in this district, are governed by New York’s three-year statute of limitations for personal injury actions, N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 214; *Pearl v. City of Long Beach*, 296 F.3d 76, 79 (2d Cir. 2002) (citation omitted); *Hernandez-Avila v. Averill*, 725 F.2d 25, 27 n.3 (2d Cir. 1984). But, claims under § 1986 have a one-year statute of limitations, see 42 U.S.C. § 1986. Federal courts are also obligated to apply New York’s tolling rules. *Bd. of Regents of Univ. of the State of N.Y. v. Tomanio*, 446 U.S. 478, 483 (1980).

On March 20, 2020, then-Governor Andrew Cuomo issued Executive Order 202.8, which tolled the statute of limitations in New York in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. ⁹ N.Y.C.R.R. § 8.202.8. Subsequent orders extended the tolling period until November 3, 2020. Exec. Order 202.67 (Oct. 4,

2020). Contrary to the DA Defendants’ assertion, see DA Defs. Mem. at 7–8, other courts in this district have uniformly concluded that Executive Order 202.8 applies to federal cases applying New York’s statute of limitations, including for § 1983 claims. See, e.g., *Lewis v. Westchester Cnty.*, No. 20 Civ. 9017, 2021 WL 3932626, at *2 n.3 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 2, 2021).⁸ The Court concludes, therefore, that Executive Order 202.8 tolls the statute of limitations for Plaintiff’s §§ 1983 and 1985 claims, which apply New York’s three-year limitations period—but not Plaintiff’s § 1986 claims, because the applicable statute of limitations for that claim is found in the federal statute itself.

⁸ The DA Defendants’ reliance on *Johnson v. Fargione* is unavailing. In that case, the court found that the plaintiff’s claims, which had expired weeks before the issuance of Executive Order 202.8, could not “be said to have been tolled” by that Executive Order, as the time for filing had already passed and the plaintiff had offered no excuse for the delay. 20 Civ. 764, 2021 WL 1406683, at *3 (N.D.N.Y. Feb. 17, 2021), *report and recommendation adopted* 2021 WL 1404554 (Apr. 14, 2021). Although *Johnson* is instructive with respect to how claims that may have expired before the issuance of Executive Order 202.8 (*i.e.*, before March 20, 2020) should be treated, it does not address the applicability of the Executive Order to federal claims that, like Plaintiff’s, had not yet expired by that date.

Section 1983 claims based on malicious prosecution or deprivation of a fair trial accrue when the underlying criminal action against the plaintiff is “favorably” terminated, rather than at the time of arrest. *Sharp v. Cnty. of Putnam*, No. 18 Civ. 780, 2019 WL 2250412, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. May 24, 2019); *Shabazz v. Kailer*, 201 F. Supp. 3d 386, 394 (S.D.N.Y. 2016). The dismissal of an indictment constitutes the termination of a proceeding. *Sharp*, 2019 WL 2250412, at *4–5. Applying these principles, Plaintiff’s § 1983 claims for malicious prosecution (Count 3) and denial of a fair trial (Count 4) accrued on October 17, 2017, the date the trial court dismissed the indictment against him. Dismissal Tr. at 5. And, although the statute of limitations would have expired on October 17, 2020, New York’s COVID-19 tolling rule extended the limitations period until June 2, 2021.⁹ Because Plaintiff commenced this suit on March 12, 2021, Counts 3 and 4 are timely.

9 Executive Order 202.8 tolled applicable limitations periods from March 20, 2020 to November 3, 2020. The order amounted to a “pause” in the limitations period—that is, during the duration of the toll, the clock to file [did] not run,” but “[o]nce the toll end[ed,] the clock resume[d] from where it was when the toll began, and the plaintiff ha[d] the rest of his limitations period to file his complaint,” *Johnston v. City of Syracuse*, No. 20 Civ. 1497, 2021 WL 3930703, at *6 (N.D.N.Y. Sept. 2, 2021). Because, as of March 20, 2020, when the clock was “paused,” Plaintiff had 211 days remaining before the expiration of the limitations period on October 17, 2020, the Court calculates 211 days after November 3, 2020, as the end of the relevant limitations period when tolled—which is June 2, 2021.

*9 By contrast, a § 1983 abuse-of-process claim accrues when the criminal process is “set in motion—typically at arrest—against the plaintiff.” *Hadid v. City of N.Y.*, No. 15 Civ. 19, 2015 WL 7734098, at *5 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 30, 2015), *aff’d* 730 F. App’x 68 (2d Cir. 2018). Because Plaintiff was arrested on January 27, 2016, the relevant statute of limitations for Count 8, § 1983 abuse of process, expired on January 27, 2019, and COVID-19 tolling provisions are, therefore, inapplicable. Accordingly, this claim is DISMISSED with prejudice as untimely.

Section 1985(3) conspiracy claims accrue “at the time of the events that caused the injury.” *Panetta v. Cassel*, 20 Civ. 2255, 2020 WL 2521533, at *5 (S.D.N.Y. May 18, 2020). The existence of a conspiracy “does not postpone the accrual of causes of action arising out of the conspirators’ separate wrongs. It is the wrongful act, not the conspiracy, which is actionable, whether the act is labelled a tort or a violation of [federal civil rights statutes].” *Singleton v. City of N.Y.*, 632 F.2d 185, 192 (2d Cir. 1980) (citation omitted). As discussed, the single allegation that escapes absolute immunity—and therefore is the only remaining basis for Plaintiff’s claims against the DA Defendants—is that those defendants suborned perjury in the grand jury proceedings by coaching Jackson to give false testimony, resulting in Plaintiff’s indictment and arrest. Plaintiff’s § 1985(3) claim—Count 5 of the complaint—accrued no later than January 27, 2016, the date of his arrest—which again, applying a three-year statute of limitations untouched by COVID-19 tolling provisions, renders it untimely. Count 5 is, accordingly, DISMISSED with prejudice.

Similarly, Count 6, Plaintiff’s § 1986 conspiracy claim, accrued when Plaintiff knew, or had reason to know of the harm or injury. *Young v. Lord & Taylor, LLC*, 937 F. Supp. 2d 346, 354 (E.D.N.Y. 2013). Plaintiff knew of the injury by his arrest date. Applying § 1986’s one-year statute of limitations, any § 1986 claim Plaintiff brought after January 27, 2017, is untimely.¹⁰ Accordingly, Count 6 is DISMISSED with prejudice.

10 Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Plaintiff would not have had reason to know of the harm or injury that was the basis of his Section 1986 claim until the date the indictment was dismissed (October 17, 2017), the claim would still be time-barred, because this would only extend the limitations period to October 17, 2018—nearly three years before the commencement of this action.

2. State Claims

Counts 10 and 14 of the complaint—both state common-law claims—are also time-barred. “Under New York law, a plaintiff asserting tort claims against the City or its employees,” as well as against municipal officials like district attorneys, “must file a notice of claim within [90] days after the incident giving rise to the claim and commence the action within a year and [90] days from the date of the incident.” *Brown v. City of N.Y.*, No. 18 Civ. 3287, 2020 WL 1819880, at *7 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 9, 2020) (citing N.Y. Gen. Mun. Law §§ 50-e(1)(a), 50-i(1)); *see also Gonzalez v. City of N.Y.*, No. 94 Civ. 7377, 1996 WL 227824, *2 (S.D.N.Y. May 3, 1996). Plaintiff asserts that he filed the requisite notice of claim with the City on January 16, 2018—720 days after his arrest, and 91 days after the dismissal of the indictment. Compl. ¶ 16. Plaintiff did not commence this action until March 12, 2021. *See* Compl. Therefore, Plaintiff neither timely filed a notice of claim within 90 days, nor did he commence this lawsuit within a year and 90 days after the date the indictment was dismissed—the last date that could possibly serve as the trigger for the statute of limitations. Failure to comply with the mandatory notice of claim requirements is a basis for dismissal of a plaintiff’s claims. *Warner v. Vill. of Goshen Police Dep’t*, 256 F. Supp. 2d 171, 175 (S.D.N.Y. 2003). The Court, accordingly, concludes that Counts 10 and 14 are also time-barred, and therefore, these claims are DISMISSED with prejudice.

C. Personal Involvement

*10 Liability under § 1983 must be premised on a defendant's direct, personal involvement in the alleged violations. See *Tangreti v. Bachmann*, 983 F.3d 609, 618 (2d Cir. 2020). A defendant cannot be held vicariously liable under § 1983 for employing or supervising an employee that violated the plaintiff's rights—rather, a plaintiff must plead “that each Government-official defendant, through the official's own individual actions, has violated the Constitution.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 676.

As to Vance, Plaintiff only alleges that he served as the DA of New York County. Compl. ¶ 11. Vance may not be held liable for merely employing or supervising Kalra and Nasar. See *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 676. And, Plaintiff neither pleads that Vance was personally involved in investigating the shooting or prosecuting him, nor is there any evidence in the record to support such a finding. Accordingly, Plaintiff's claims against Vance are DISMISSED with prejudice, because given the lack of evidence of Vance's personal involvement, the Court finds that granting leave to amend would be futile. *Hill v. Curcione*, 657 F.3d 116, 123–24 (2d Cir. 2011).

Plaintiff similarly fails to specify Kalra and Nasar's personal involvement in his claimed constitutional violations, stating only that the “Prosecuting Attorneys” coached Jackson to provide testimony. Compl. ¶ 50. But, given Plaintiff's position as a *pro se* litigant, the Court recognizes that there may be additional information made available to Plaintiff through discovery that would enable Plaintiff to assert claims directly against Kalra and Nasar, such as if, for example, either of them prepared Jackson to testify. By April 15, 2022, accordingly, the DA Defendants shall, through counsel, inform Plaintiff and the Court whether Kalra or Nasar prepared Jackson to testify before the grand jury with respect to any potential criminal charges against Plaintiff, and/or conducted an examination of Jackson before the grand jury. No later than May 16, 2022, Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint, alleging with specificity Kalra and Nasar's direct, personal involvement in either “coaching” Jackson to testify falsely before the grand jury, or deliberately eliciting false testimony from Jackson during the grand jury proceedings. In addition, because, as detailed *infra* at 25–26, the Court finds that Plaintiff's malicious prosecution claim is deficient because he failed to allege that the underlying criminal proceedings terminated in his favor, an argument raised by the City Defendants but not the DA Defendants, any amended malicious prosecution claim that Plaintiff wishes to assert against Kalra and Nasar should also address this issue. Failure

to do so shall result in dismissal with prejudice of Plaintiff's remaining claims against Kalra and Nasar.

V. City's Motion to Dismiss

Plaintiff brings claims against the City Defendants, on the grounds that (1) Miller failed to conduct a thorough and complete investigation of the shooting, by not interviewing several witnesses, including the 911 caller, Compl. ¶¶ 36–37, 39; (2) in his investigation, Miller obtained—but disregarded—surveillance video from both the inside and outside of Highline Ballroom, *id.* ¶¶ 40–43; (3) that Miller “used his own added facts and embellished statements” in his investigative reports to target Plaintiff as the sole suspect in the shooting, *id.* ¶ 44, *see also* ¶ 39; (4) that Corrado, as Miller's supervisor, approved his investigative reports but failed to notice the inconsistencies and contradictions therein, *id.* ¶ 95; and (5) that Passamenti “authorized DNA tests,” which revealed that the DNA evidence recovered at the scene “did not match Plaintiff,” *id.* ¶ 96. The Court addresses each remaining¹¹ cause of action.

¹¹ As noted, the Court dismissed Count 7 for relying on a statute that does not provide a private right of action, *see supra* at 7; Count 9 for being duplicative of Count 4, *see id.* at 8, and all the state constitutional claims Plaintiff asserts analogously to his federal constitutional claims, *see id.*

A. Time Bar

1. Section 1983 Claims

*11 Plaintiff brings claims under § 1983 for unlawful search and seizure (Count 1); false arrest (Count 2); malicious prosecution (Count 3); deprivation of a fair trial (Count 4); and abuse of process (Count 8). As noted, § 1983 claims are subject to a three-year statute of limitations in this district. See *supra* at 15. And, for the reasons discussed with respect to the DA Defendants, the Court concludes that Counts 3 and 4 were timely pleaded. See *supra* at 16–17.

A § 1983 unlawful search and seizure claim, however, accrues on the date the allegedly unlawful search occurred. *McClanahan v. Kelly*, No. 12 Civ. 5326, 2014 WL 1317612, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2014). Plaintiff alleges that his property was searched on January 9, February 12, and February 15, 2016. Compl. ¶¶ 46–47. The applicable statute of limitations, therefore, expired no later than February 15, 2019, nearly

two years before Plaintiff brought suit. Plaintiff's claims are, therefore, untimely, and Count 1 is DISMISSED with prejudice as time-barred.

Section 1983 false arrest claims and abuse-of-process claims accrue from the date of Plaintiff's arrest. *See Rivera v. City of N.Y.*, No. 16 Civ. 9709, 2019 WL 252019, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 17, 2019) (false arrest); *Anderson v. Cnty. of Putnam*, No. 14 Civ. 7162, 2016 WL 297737, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 22, 2016) (abuse-of-process). Plaintiff was arrested on January 27, 2016, and therefore, any such claims should have been brought no later than January 27, 2019. Counts 2 and 8 are, accordingly, DISMISSED with prejudice as untimely.

2. Sections 1985(3) and 1986 Claims

Liberalizing construing the complaint, in Count 5, Plaintiff sets forth a conspiracy cause of action under § 1985(3), alleging that the City Defendants engaged in a conspiracy to have Plaintiff wrongfully convicted, *see* Compl. ¶ 97. This claim appears predicated on the NYPD investigation into the January 6, 2016 shooting, and Miller's alleged embellishment of information, and focus on Plaintiff as the sole suspect. *Id.* ¶¶ 36–37, 39, 46, 90. Plaintiff also raises a failure-to-intervene claim under § 1986 (Count 6), seemingly arising from Corrado's alleged failure to notice the inconsistencies and contradictory statements allegedly included in Miller's police reports. *Id.* ¶ 95.

Section 1985(3) claims accrue “at the time of the events that caused the injury,” and are subject to a three-year statute of limitations, *Panetta*, 2020 WL 2521533, at *5. Section 1986 claims based on a failure to intervene accrue when the defendant fails to intervene, *Thomas v. City of Troy*, 293 F. Supp. 3d 282, 303 (N.D.N.Y. 2018), and must be brought within one year, *see* 42 U.S.C. § 1986. Plaintiff's claims each began accruing no later than January 27, 2016, the date of Plaintiff's arrest, because Plaintiff does not suggest that any investigation took place after that date. The applicable limitations period extends no later than January 27, 2019, for Plaintiff's § 1985(3) claim, and January 27, 2017 for Plaintiff's § 1986 claim, two and four years, respectively, before the complaint was filed. Counts 5 and 6 are, therefore, DISMISSED with prejudice as time-barred.

3. State Claims

To the extent Plaintiff's state common-law claims, asserting various types of negligence, arise from the NYPD investigation into the shooting on January 6, 2016; the searches of Plaintiff's property on January 9, February 12, and February 15, 2016; and Plaintiff's arrest on January 27, 2016, Plaintiff was required to file a notice of claim within 90 days of those events, *see* N.Y. Gen. Mun. L. § 50-e. As noted, Plaintiff did not file a notice of claim with the City until January 16, 2018—one year and eleven months after the latest of those dates. Compl. ¶ 16. Accordingly, each of Plaintiff's negligence claims (Counts 10–14) are DISMISSED with prejudice.¹²

12

As discussed *supra* at 18–19, even if the Court construes Plaintiff's notice of claim as timely based on the dismissal of Plaintiff's criminal case on October 17, 2017, Plaintiff still failed to commence this action within one year and 90 days, as required by statute. This provides an alternative ground for dismissal.

B. Claim Against the City¹³

13

Plaintiff also names the NYPD as a defendant. *See* Compl. But, the NYPD is a non-suable agency of the City, and thus, to the extent any of Plaintiff's claims are brought against it, they fail as a matter of law. *See Jenkins v. City of N.Y.*, 478 F.3d 76, 93 n.19 (2d Cir. 2007). Any such claims are, accordingly, DISMISSED with prejudice.

*12 The Court reads Plaintiff's complaint as claiming, under *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, that the City is liable for the allegedly unlawful conduct of the named NYPD officers. *See* Compl. ¶ 179. The City Defendants argue that Plaintiff does not include sufficient factual allegations to support a municipal liability claim. City Defs. Mem. at 20–22, ECF No. 34. The Court agrees.

To bring a municipal liability claim under § 1983, the plaintiff must “prove the existence of a municipal policy or custom,” then demonstrate a causal connection between the policy and the alleged constitutional deprivation. *Vipolis v. Vill. of Haverstraw*, 768 F.2d 40, 44 (2d Cir. 1985). Plaintiff pleads neither, offering only conclusory allegations that the City Defendants “engaged in a pattern and practice to commit the aforementioned unlawful acts,” Compl. ¶ 179, and that a policy is “inferred” because the City Defendants “took no steps to reprimand or discharge the officers involved,” ECF No. 39 at 27. These allegations cannot, without more,

state a claim for municipal liability. *E.g.*, *Fleming v. City of New York*, No. 18 Civ. 4866, 2020 WL 5522871, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. July 23, 2020). Because Plaintiff offers no facts which suggest that the deficiencies in his *Monell* claim may be cured by amendment, any such claim is DISMISSED with prejudice. *Strong v. City of Syracuse*, No. 16 Civ. 1054, 2020 WL 137250, at *3–4 (N.D.N.Y. Jan. 13, 2020) (dismissing *Monell* claim, with prejudice, given “[p]laintiff’s conclusory allegations are insufficient to plausibly infer a custom or policy to support municipal liability”).

C. Passamenti’s Personal Involvement

Plaintiff’s remaining claims are Counts 3 (malicious prosecution) and 4 (denial of a fair trial). As to Defendant Passamenti, Plaintiff alleges that Passamenti authorized DNA tests, which revealed that the DNA evidence recovered at the scene “did not match Plaintiff.” Compl. ¶ 96. Plaintiff does not allege that Passamenti was involved in falsification of evidence, that he attempted to hide the results of the relevant DNA tests, or that he was otherwise responsible for, or even aware of, the alleged “embellishment” of statements in the NYPD’s investigative reports. Plaintiff has not, therefore, sufficiently alleged Passamenti’s direct, personal involvement in any constitutional violations under § 1983. *Tangreti*, 983 F.3d at 618. And, because the record does not establish that Plaintiff could cure this pleading defect by amendment, Plaintiff’s claims against Passamenti are DISMISSED with prejudice.

D. Malicious Prosecution

A claim for malicious prosecution under § 1983—Count 3 of the complaint—requires the plaintiff to show that the criminal proceedings against him were terminated “in his favor,” typically by an acquittal or another form of dismissal of the charges on the merits. *Janetka v. Dabe*, 892 F.2d 187, 189–90 (1989). The City Defendants argue that Plaintiff has not made such a showing. City Defs. Mem. at 10, 14–17. The Court agrees. Plaintiff asserts—citing no authority in support—that the dismissal of the indictment was a “termination in his favor” because dismissals that “include constitutional privilege assertions are considered favorable terminations.” ECF No. 39 at 7, 10 (quotation marks omitted). It is not clear what Plaintiff means by this. And, from the Court’s review of the state court transcript, it appears that, in dismissing the indictment, neither the prosecution, nor the court, made any statements indicating a belief in Plaintiff’s innocence. *See Lanning v. City of Glens Falls*, 908 F.3d 19, 28 (2d Cir. 2018) (looking to the “reasons ... stated on the record for dismissing

the charges” in determining whether the termination of the criminal case was in plaintiff’s favor). Indeed, Kalra expressly declined to concede that Plaintiff was innocent, instead reaffirming her belief that Plaintiff “was the shooter.” Dismissal Tr. at 15. The presiding judge similarly stated on the record that dismissal of the indictment was warranted even though he did not “see any prosecutorial misconduct.” *Id.* at 16. The dismissal of the indictment, therefore, left open the question of Plaintiff’s guilt or innocence, and Plaintiff cannot, accordingly, assert on that basis alone, that the proceedings were terminated in his favor.

*13 The Court notes, however, that because four years have passed since the dismissal of the indictment, Plaintiff may be able to plead additional facts from that time that support this relevant element of his claim. There is no information before the Court as to whether, for example, Plaintiff was ever informed by the prosecutors that he had been cleared of wrongdoing, whether Jackson or anyone else was later prosecuted for the shooting, or whether the state court made any further statements regarding the merits of the charges against Plaintiff. Count 3 is, accordingly, DISMISSED without prejudice, to provide Plaintiff with an opportunity to plead additional facts to support this claim.

E. Denial of Fair Trial

To state a claim under § 1983 for denial of a fair trial based on the fabrication of evidence by a police officer—Count 4 of the complaint—a plaintiff must allege that “an (1) investigating official (2) fabricates information (3) that is likely to influence a jury’s verdict, (4) forwards that information to prosecutors, and (5) the plaintiff suffers a deprivation of life, liberty, or property as a result.” *Garnett v. Undercover Officer C0039*, 838 F.3d 265, 277 (2d Cir. 2016) (citation omitted). The plaintiff need not show a favorable termination indicative of innocence to state such a claim. *Smalls v. Collins*, 10 F. 4th 117, 142–43 (2d Cir. 2021). The City Defendants argue that Plaintiff has failed to show a deprivation of his liberty interests because there was probable cause for his prosecution, in the form of corroborative ballistics evidence. City Defs. Mem. at 16 (citing Dismissal Tr. at 15); City Defs. Reply at 6–7, ECF No. 46.

Probable cause is not a complete defense to a fair trial claim. *Torres v. City of N.Y.*, No. 16 Civ. 6719, 2017 WL 4325822, at *5 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 27, 2017) (noting that where “independent probable cause exists for the prosecution,” a plaintiff must “show that the misconduct caused some deprivation above and beyond the fact of the prosecution itself.” (citation

omitted)). Plaintiff plausibly alleges that Miller fabricated and “embellished” Jackson's statements in his investigative report; that Miller provided these reports to prosecutors to secure Plaintiff's indictment and arrest; and that Corrado, as Miller's supervisor, reviewed and approved these reports without identifying any “embellishments” or obvious factual contradictions. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 44–49, 95. On a motion to dismiss, the Court cannot take as true the City Defendants' factual assertion that, regardless of any alleged fabrications in Miller's reports, the prosecution had independent ballistics evidence to satisfy the probable cause standard. *Compare* City Defs. Reply at 6–7, with ECF No. 39 at 9–12. It cannot, therefore, find as a matter of law, that the City Defendants had probable cause for Plaintiff's indictment and prosecution. *See Bullard v. City of N.Y.*, 240 F. Supp. 2d 292, 299 (S.D.N.Y. 2003). The Court concludes, therefore, that Plaintiff has sufficiently alleged a § 1983 denial of fair trial claim against Miller and Corrado. The City Defendants' motion to dismiss Count 4 of the complaint is, accordingly, DENIED.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the State's motion to dismiss, ECF No. 20, is GRANTED, and Plaintiff's claims against the State are DISMISSED. The DA Defendants' motion

to dismiss, ECF No. 22, is GRANTED—Plaintiff's claims against Vance are DISMISSED; and his claims against Kalra and Nasar are DISMISSED except for Counts 3 and 4, which are DISMISSED without prejudice to renewal in an amended complaint. By **April 15, 2022**, the DA Defendants shall make the disclosures directed in this order. The City Defendants' motion to dismiss is DENIED as to Count 4, and GRANTED in all other respects. Plaintiff's claims against Passamenti, the NYPD, and the City are DISMISSED; and his claims against Miller and Corrado are DISMISSED, except for Count 3, which is DISMISSED without prejudice to renewal in an amended complaint.

***14** By **May 16, 2022**, Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint as to Counts 3 and 4, with the additional factual allegations detailed in this order. The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate the motions pending at ECF Nos. 20, 22, and 32, and mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff *pro se*. The Court shall separately provide Plaintiff with a copy of all unpublished cases cited herein.

SO ORDERED.

All Citations

Slip Copy, 2022 WL 992885

2021 WL 3037709

2021 WL 3037709

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, N.D. New York.

Rondue GENTRY, Plaintiff,

v.

State of NEW YORK; Kyle Filli; David Hurley; Heath McCrindle; Steven Sharp; and David Soares, Defendants.

1:21-CV-0319 (GTS/ML)

I

Signed 06/14/2021

Attorneys and Law Firms

Rondue Gentry, Plaintiff, Pro Se, Lakeview Shock Incarceration Correctional Facility, P.O. Box T, Brocton, New York 14716.

ORDER and REPORT-RECOMMENDATION

Miroslav Lovric, U.S. Magistrate Judge

I. INTRODUCTION

*1 The Clerk has sent this *pro se* complaint (Dkt. No. 1) together with an amended application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. No. 5) filed by Rondue Gentry ("Plaintiff") to the Court for review. For the reasons discussed below, I grant Plaintiff's amended *in forma pauperis* application (Dkt. No. 5) and recommend that the Complaint be accepted for filing in part, dismissed in part without leave to amend, and dismissed in part with leave to amend.

II. BACKGROUND

On March 22, 2021, Plaintiff commenced this action by filing a verified Complaint and a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Dkt. Nos. 1, 2.) On March 23, 2021, the Court denied Plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* application as incomplete and administratively closed the case. (Dkt. No. 4.) On April 9, 2021, Plaintiff filed an amended *in forma pauperis* application. (Dkt. No. 5.) As a result, the case was reopened and restored to the Court's active docket. (Dkt. No. 6.)

Construed as liberally¹ as possible, the Complaint generally alleges that Plaintiff's civil rights were violated by the State of New York, New York State Police Officers Kyle Filli, David Hurley, and Heath McCrindle, and Assistant District Attorney

Steven Sharp and Albany County District Attorney David Soares (collectively "Defendants"). (See generally Dkt. No. 1.)

¹ The court must interpret *pro se* complaints to raise the strongest arguments they suggest. *Soto v. Walker*, 44 F.3d 169, 173 (2d Cir. 1995) (quoting *Burgos v. Hopkins*, 14 F.3d 787, 790 (2d Cir. 1994)).

More specifically, Plaintiff alleges that on September 2, 2016, he was arrested on felony charges but released on bail on September 9, 2016. (*Id.* at 3.) While out on bail, Plaintiff alleges that on April 9, 2017, Defendant Filli stopped him while he was driving near a toll plaza. (*Id.* at 3 & Attach. 2 at 2 [Pl.'s Exs.].)² Plaintiff alleges that, during the stop, "Defendant [] Filli [] falsely accused Plaintiff of having a lit marijuana blunt in his ashtray" and that when instructed to exit his vehicle, Plaintiff put items down the side of his seat and eventually drove away from the officer. (Dkt. No. 1 at 3.) After he allegedly fled the scene, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Filli falsely accused Plaintiff of making four "u-turns" on the interstate and, at one point, traveling at 127 miles per hour, and made "several [other] vehicle and traffic law violations." (*Id.*) Defendant Filli eventually lost sight of Plaintiff's vehicle. (Dkt. No. 1, Attach. 2 at 2.)

² "A copy of a written instrument that is an exhibit to a pleading is a part of the pleading for all purposes." Fed. R. Civ. P. 10(c); *Cortec Indus., Inc. v. Sum Holding L.P.*, 949 F.2d 42, 47 (2d Cir. 1991) ("the complaint is deemed to include any written instrument attached to it as an exhibit or any statements or documents incorporated in it by reference.").

On or about April 11, 2017, Plaintiff alleges that he was contacted by his attorney,³ who informed Plaintiff that he had received a call from Defendant Sharp, the Albany County District Attorney, regarding the incident with Defendant Filli on April 9, 2017. Plaintiff alleges that his attorney informed him that if he did not turn himself in, a warrant would be issued for his arrest. (Dkt. No. 1 at 4.) On the advice of his attorney, Plaintiff alleges that he appeared at the Albany City Courthouse on April 18, 2017, "to address the matter in good faith and resolve any and all confusion[.]" (*Id.*) Plaintiff alleges that when he arrived at the courthouse with his attorney, he was arrested by Defendant Hurley for charges

“lo[d]ged against him by Defendant Kyle Filli ... which were all false allegations.” (*Id.*)

3 Plaintiff's references to “his attorney” in the Complaint appear to relate to his representation in certain criminal matters. Plaintiff has indicated to the Court that he is proceeding *pro se* in this matter. (Dkt. No. 1 at 1.)

*2 Plaintiff next alleges that he was then taken to the State Trooper Barracks where Defendant McCrindle “falsified a legal document alleging to have read Plaintiff his Miranda right warnings when this is not true.” (*Id.*) The same day he was arrested, on April 18, 2017, Plaintiff alleges that he was transported to Guilderland County Courthouse and arraigned on charges from both the Town of Guilderland and the City of Albany. (*Id.*)

Following his arraignment, Plaintiff alleges that he was transported to the Albany County Courthouse and “arraigned on a bail revocation hearing for a prior case.” (*Id.* at 5.) Plaintiff alleges that his bail was then revoked, and he was transported to the Albany County Correctional Facility where he remained confined for eleven months. (*Id.*)

On April 20, 2017, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Soares “maliciously prosecuted” him under case number 17040697 in the Town of Guilderland and case number 17-244811 in the City of Albany while “knowing the allegations [against Plaintiff] were false.” (*Id.*) Plaintiff next alleges that, on March 16, 2018, “approximately eleven (11) months after being arraigned in Guilderland County Court ... Plaintiff received a certificate of disposition dismissing the entire [p]roceeding in favor of the accused.” (*Id.*) The Complaint includes a “Certificate of Disposition” from Albany City Court for case number 17-244811, certifying that a “Judgment of Dismissal” was entered as to certain charges against Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 1, Attach. 2 at 12.) The Complaint also includes a copy of a letter from the Deputy Court Clerk for the Town of Guilderland referencing “Case 17040697” and stating that “this case was transferred to Albany City Court as Guilderland Town Court did not have jurisdiction over this case.” (*Id.* at 14.)

Liberally construed, the Complaint appears to allege the following claims: (1) the State of New York failed to “properly train” its state police officers, leading to his false arrest, malicious prosecution, violation of due process rights, and cruel and unusual punishment; (2) Defendants Filli and Hurley, in their individual and official capacities, fabricated

evidence and falsely arrested Plaintiff in violation of the Fourth Amendment and Plaintiff's right to due process; (3) Defendant McCrindle, in his individual and official capacity, fabricated evidence and failed to read Plaintiff his *Miranda* warnings, in violation of Plaintiff's right to due process; (4) Defendant Sharp, in his individual and official capacity, had no “valid or proper warrant” to detain Plaintiff; and that (5) Defendants Sharp and Soares, in their individual and official capacities, “maliciously prosecuted” Plaintiff in violation of the Fourth Amendment and Plaintiff's right to due process. (Dkt. No. 1 at 4-8.)

As relief, Plaintiff seeks money damages from all Defendants, including \$20,000,000 from the State of New York; \$5,000,000 from Defendant Filli; \$5,000,000 from Defendant Hurley; \$1,000,000 from Defendant McCrindle; \$3,000,000 from Defendant Sharp; and \$10,000,000 from Defendant Soares. (*Id.* at 7-8.)

For a more complete statement of Plaintiff's claims, refer to the Complaint. (Dkt. No. 1.)

III. PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED APPLICATION TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

“28 U.S.C. § 1915 permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in a federal court without prepayment of the filing fee that would ordinarily be charged.” *Cash v. Bernstein*, 09-CV-1922, 2010 WL 5185047, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 26, 2010). “Although an indigent, incarcerated individual need not prepay the filing fee at the time of filing, he must subsequently pay the fee, to the extent he is able to do so, through periodic withdrawals from his inmate accounts.” *Cash*, 2010 WL 5185047, at *1 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b); *Harris v. City of New York*, 607 F.3d 18, 21 (2d Cir. 2010)).⁴

4 Section § 1915(g) prohibits a prisoner from proceeding *in forma pauperis* where, absent a showing of “imminent danger of serious physical injury,” a prisoner has filed three or more actions that were subsequently dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or failing to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's litigation history on the Federal Judiciary's Public Access to Court Electronic Records (“PACER”) Service. See <http://pacer.uspci.uscourts.gov>. It does not appear from that review that Plaintiff had accumulated three

strikes for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) as of the date this action was commenced.

*3 Upon review, the Court finds that Plaintiff has submitted a completed *in forma pauperis* application (Dkt. No. 5) which demonstrates economic need. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2). Plaintiff has also filed an inmate authorization form. (Dkt. No. 3.) Accordingly, Plaintiff's amended application to proceed with this action *in forma pauperis* is granted.

IV. LEGAL STANDARD FOR INITIAL REVIEW OF COMPLAINT

Having found that Plaintiff meets the financial criteria for commencing this action *in forma pauperis*, and because Plaintiff seeks relief from an officer or employee of a governmental entity, the Court must consider the sufficiency of the allegations set forth in the Complaint in light of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). Section 1915(e) of Title 28 of the United States Code directs that, when a plaintiff seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis*, “the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that— ... (B) the action ... (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).⁵

⁵ To determine whether an action is frivolous, a court must look to see whether the complaint “lacks an arguable basis in either law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

Similarly, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, a court must review any “complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a government entity or officer or employee of a government entity” and must “identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint ... is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or ... seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b); see also *Carr v. Dvorin*, 171 F.3d 115, 116 (2d Cir. 1999) (per curiam) (noting that Section 1915A applies to all actions brought by prisoners against governmental officials even when plaintiff paid the filing fee).

Additionally, when reviewing a complaint, a court may also look to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a pleading which sets forth a claim for relief shall contain, *inter alia*, “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader

is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). The purpose of Rule 8 “is to give fair notice of the claim being asserted so as to permit the adverse party the opportunity to file a responsive answer, prepare an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* is applicable.” *Powell v. Marine Midland Bank*, 162 F.R.D. 15, 16 (N.D.N.Y. 1995) (McAvoy, C.J.) (quoting *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977)).

A court should not dismiss a complaint if the plaintiff has stated “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). While the court should construe the factual allegations in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, “the tenet that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions.” *Ashcroft*, 556 U.S. at 678. “Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Id.* (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555). Rule 8 “demands more than an unadorned the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Id.* Thus, a pleading that contains only allegations which “are so vague as to fail to give the defendants adequate notice of the claims against them” is subject to dismissal. *Sheehy v. Brown*, 335 F. App'x 102, 104 (2d Cir. 2009).

V. ANALYSIS

*4 In addressing the sufficiency of a plaintiff's complaint, the court must construe his pleadings liberally. *Sealed Plaintiff v. Sealed Defendant*, 537 F.3d 185, 191 (2d Cir. 2008). Having reviewed the Complaint with this principle in mind, I recommend that the Complaint be accepted for filing in part and dismissed in part.

A. Heck Delayed Accrual Claims

“A claim for damages [that would necessarily imply the invalidity of a plaintiff's state court] conviction or sentence that has *not* been so invalidated is not cognizable under § 1983.” *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994). In *Covington v. City of New York*, the Second Circuit held that “if success on a § 1983 claim would necessarily impugn the validity of a conviction in a pending criminal prosecution, such a claim *does not accrue* so long as the potential for a judgment in the pending criminal prosecution continues

to exist.” *Covington v. City of New York*, 171 F.3d 117, 124 (2d Cir. 1999); see also *McDonough v. Smith*, 139 S. Ct. 2149, 2156-57 (2019) (holding that a plaintiff could not bring a “fabricated-evidence claim under § 1983 prior to favorable termination of his prosecution”); *Perry v. City of Albany*, 20-CV-165, 2020 WL 3405636, at *4 (N.D.N.Y. May 6, 2020) (Stewart, M.J.) (“[c]laims of false arrest, false imprisonment, malicious prosecution, and fabrication of evidence are generally viewed as barred by the rule in *Heck*.”), report and recommendation adopted by, 2020 WL 3403080 (N.D.N.Y. June 19, 2020) (Suddaby, C.J.); *McFadden v. Jaeson*, 12-CV-1255, 2012 WL 4107466, at *2 (N.D.N.Y. Aug. 23, 2012) (Randolph, M.J.) (barring claims for false arrest and “faulty *Miranda* warnings” pursuant to *Heck*), report and recommendation adopted by, 2012 WL 4107465 (N.D.N.Y. Sept. 18, 2012) (Mordue, J.); *Harris v. Buffardi*, 08-CV-1322, 2011 WL 3794235, at *10 (N.D.N.Y. Aug. 24, 2011) (Sharpe, J.) (claims for “violation of his due process rights, fabrication of evidence, obstruction of justice, bad faith inadequate investigation, and §§ 1983 and 1985 conspiracy—all of which are patent attacks on the validity of [plaintiff’s] conviction—[were] barred.”).

Plaintiff specifically alleges that the case against him in the City of Albany, case number 17-244811, was “terminated in his favor” on March 16, 2018 when he received a “Judgement of Dismissal.” (Dkt. No. 1 at 5, Attach. 2 at 12.) However, Plaintiff does not similarly allege that the case against him in the Town of Guilderland, case number 17040697, was also dismissed or otherwise terminated in his favor. Instead, Plaintiff vaguely alleges that the “entire proceeding” was dismissed and that the charges against him were “terminated in his favor.” (Dkt. No. 1 at 5, 7.) While the Complaint includes a copy of a letter from the Deputy Court Clerk for the Town of Guilderland referencing “Case 17040697” that states that “th[e] case was transferred to Albany City Court as Guilderland Town Court did not have jurisdiction[,]” Plaintiff does not specifically allege how the charges from that case were resolved. (Dkt. No. 1, Attach. 2 at 14.)

Because Plaintiff has failed to allege sufficient facts showing that the case filed against him in the Town of Guilderland terminated in his favor, the Court has a basis to dismiss all of Plaintiff’s claims relating to that case as premature pursuant to *Heck*. However, because I also recommend that nearly all of Plaintiff’s claims should be dismissed for the additional, independent reasons that follow, I only recommend that the fabrication of evidence claims relating to the charges against Plaintiff in the Town of Guilderland against Defendants Filli,

Hurley, and McCrindle, in their individual capacities, be dismissed as premature pursuant to *Heck*.⁶

6 The Complaint does not separate claims against the Defendants based on the two underlying criminal cases against Plaintiff in the City of Albany and Town of Guilderland. However, as discussed in Section V.D.1.iii. of this Report-Recommendation, Plaintiff’s fabrication of evidence claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle, in their individual capacities, that relate to the criminal charges against Plaintiff in the City of Albany, should be accepted for filing.

B. Claims Against the State of New York

*5 The Eleventh Amendment provides that “[t]he Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.” U.S. CONST. amend. XI. Regardless of the nature of the relief sought, in the absence of the State’s consent or waiver of immunity, a suit against the State or one of its agencies or departments is proscribed by the Eleventh Amendment. *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984). “New York State has not consented to suit in federal court.” *Abrahams v. Appellate Div. of Supreme Court*, 473 F. Supp. 2d 550, 556 (S.D.N.Y. 2007) (citing *Trotman v. Palisades Interstate Park Comm’n*, 557 F.2d 35, 38-40 (2d Cir. 1977)). Section 1983 claims do not abrogate the Eleventh Amendment immunity of the states. See *Quern v. Jordan*, 440 U.S. 332, 340-41 (1979). Therefore, I recommend dismissal of all claims brought by Plaintiff against the State of New York pursuant to the Eleventh Amendment.⁷

7 Plaintiff also alleges that he “filed a claim in the New York State Court of Claims [against the State of New York] dealing with the same facts involved in this action[,]” but that the case was dismissed on July 25, 2019 “due to failure of establishing proper service.” (Dkt. No. 1 at 2.) A court’s dismissal for failure to establish proper service is not a final judgment such that *res judicata* would apply. *Martin v. New York State Dep’t of Mental Hygiene*, 588 F.2d 371, 373 n.3 (2d Cir. 1978) (“a dismissal for failure of service of process, of course, has no *res judicata* effect.”); *Troeger v. Ellenville Cent. Sch. Dist.*, 15-CV-1294, 2016 WL 5107119, at *7

(N.D.N.Y. Sept. 20, 2016) (D'Agostino, J.) (“The dismissal based upon failure to join a necessary party and improper service are not final decisions on the merits for *res judicata* purposes.”). Based on the Court’s review of the New York Court of Claims public docket, Plaintiff’s case against the State of New York, Claim No. 132064, was indeed dismissed on June 3, 2019 for failure to properly serve the State of New York in accordance with the service requirements set forth in the *New York Court of Claims Act* § 11 and 22 N.Y.C.R.R. § 206.5(a). *Gentry v. State of New York*, Claim No. 132064 (N.Y. Ct. Cl. June 3, 2019).

C. Claims Against Defendants Sharp and Soares

1. Individual Capacity

“It is by now well established that a state prosecuting attorney who acted within the scope of his duties in initiating and pursuing a criminal prosecution is immune from a civil suit for damages under § 1983.” *Shmueli v. City of New York*, 424 F.3d 231, 236 (2d Cir. 2005) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted) (collecting cases). “Because the immunity attaches to the official prosecutorial function ... and because the initiation and pursuit of a criminal prosecution are quintessential prosecutorial functions ... the prosecutor has absolute immunity for the initiation and conduct of a prosecution unless he proceeds in the clear absence of all jurisdiction.” *Shmueli*, 424 F.3d at 237 (citations and internal quotation marks omitted).

These principles also protect a prosecutor against malicious prosecution claims brought under state law. *Id.* at 238; see also *Buckley v. Fitzsimmons*, 509 U.S. 259, 274 n.5 (1993) (indicating that the court’s conclusion that absolute immunity protects a prosecutor against § 1983 claims in the nature of malicious prosecution was based in part on the “common-law tradition of immunity for a prosecutor’s decision to bring an indictment, whether he has probable cause or not”); *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 424 (1976) (same principles require conferral of absolute immunity for damages claims under § 1983 and state law).

*6 However, “[a] prosecutor is not absolutely immune solely because she engaged in the conduct in question during her line of work.” *D’Alessandro v. City of New York*, 713 F. App’x 1, 5 (2d Cir. 2017) (citing *Buckley v. Fitzsimmons*, 509 U.S. 259, 273 (1993)). A prosecutor is entitled to absolute immunity

“when she acts as an ‘advocate.’ ” *Id.* (citing *Warney v. Monroe Cnty.*, 587 F.3d 113, 121 (2d Cir. 2009)). To be sure, “[a] prosecutor wears many hats” including “administrat[or],” “investigator,” and “advocate[].” *Id.* (quoting *Hill v. City of New York*, 45 F.3d 653, 656 (2d Cir. 1995)). The “functional” test of whether a prosecutor was acting as an advocate is an objective one, and a court only asks whether “the conduct in question could ‘reasonably’ fall under the rubric of the prosecutor’s function as an advocate.” *Id.* at 5 n.6. (emphasis in original) (citations omitted). “If it does, then absolutely immunity attaches even if the prosecutor engaged in those actions with vindictive or malicious intent.” *Id.*

“Under our case law, a prosecutor unquestionably acts as an advocate—and therefore receives absolute immunity—when she initiates and pursues a criminal prosecution.” *Id.* (citing *Shmueli*, 424 F.3d at 236). Indeed, “a prosecutor still acts within the scope of her duties even if she ... knowingly uses false testimony, ... engages in malicious prosecution, or attempts to intimidate an individual into accepting a guilty plea.” *Id.* (citing *Shmueli*, 424 F.3d at 237-38; *Peay v. Ajello*, 470 F.3d 65, 67-68 (2d Cir. 2006)); see also *Parker v. Soares*, 19-CV-113, 2019 WL 2232591, at *6 (N.D.N.Y. May 23, 2019) (Hummel, M.J.) (holding that prosecutorial immunity barred certain false arrest claims against Assistant District Attorney David Soares), *report and recommendation adopted by*, 2019 WL 2491918 (N.D.N.Y. June 14, 2019) (Sharpe, J.).

Here, I find that the allegations against Defendants Sharp and Soares arise out of acts intimately associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process, in their role as advocates, including the initiation of criminal proceedings against Plaintiff in the City of Albany and Town of Guilderland. As a result, I recommend that any claims against Defendants Sharp and Soares, in their individual capacity, be dismissed.

2. Official Capacity

As previously stated, “[t]he Eleventh Amendment generally bars suits against a state in federal court.” *Pikulin v. City Univ. of N.Y.*, 176 F.3d 598, 600 (2d Cir. 1999) (per curiam) (citation omitted). When a defendant is sued in his official capacity, we treat the suit as one against the “entity of which an officer is an agent.” *Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159, 165–66, (1985). If a district attorney or an assistant district attorney acts as a prosecutor, she is an agent of the state, and therefore immune from suit in her official capacity. *D’Alessandro*, 713 F. App’x

1, 8 (2d Cir. 2017) (citing *Ying Jing Gan v. City of New York*, 996 F.2d 522, 536 (2d Cir. 1993)).

Here, the claims against Defendants Sharp and Soares, in their official capacities, are effectively claims against the State of New York. For that reason, these claims must be dismissed.

D. Claims Against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle

1. Individual Capacity

Liberally construed, the Complaint alleges claims against Defendants Filli and Hurley for fabrication of evidence and false arrest, in violation of the Fourth Amendment and Plaintiff's right to due process. The Complaint also alleges claims against Defendant McCrindle for fabricating evidence and failing to read Plaintiff his *Miranda* warnings in violation of Plaintiff's right to due process. (See generally Dkt. No. 1 at 3-4, 6-8.)⁸

⁸ The Complaint makes other, sporadic legal conclusions. For example, Plaintiff alleges that, “as a result of the actions of all defendants [he has] suffered mental anguish, extreme emotion distress and cruel and unusual punishment.” (Dkt. No. 1 at 7.) Plaintiff later clarifies that he seeks to hold the State of New York liable for his “cruel and unusual punishment.” (*Id.*) However, as explained in Section V.A. above, the State of New York is immune from suit. To the extent that Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle, in their individual capacities, may have caused his “cruel and unusual punishment” or otherwise inflicted emotional distress upon him, his bare legal conclusions are insufficient to withstand the Court's review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

*7 For the following reasons, I recommend dismissal of all claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle in their official capacities. I also recommend dismissal of the false arrest claims against Defendants Filli and Hurley, in their individual capacities, and dismissal of the *Miranda* claim against Defendant McCrindle, in his individual capacity. However, I recommend that the fabrication of evidence claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle, in their

individual capacities, as relates to the case against Plaintiff in the City of Albany, be accepted for filing.

i. False Arrest Claims Against Defendants Filli and Hurley

“A § 1983 claim for false arrest, which derives from an individual's right under the Fourth Amendment to be free from unreasonable seizures, including arrest without probable cause, *see, e.g., Lennon v. Miller*, 66 F.3d 416, 423 (2d Cir. 1995), is substantially the same as a claim for false arrest under New York law.” *Kates v. Greece Police Dep't*, 16-CV-6554, 2017 WL 11548970, at *3 (W.D.N.Y. Feb. 21, 2017) (citing *Weyant v. Okst*, 101 F.3d 845, 852 (2d Cir. 1996)). Generally, the statute of limitations for a § 1983 action accruing in New York is three years. *Shomo v. City of New York*, 579 F.3d 176, 181 (2d Cir. 2009). Although the statute of limitations is an affirmative defense, where it is clear from the face of the complaint that a claim is barred by the applicable statute of limitations, the claim is subject to dismissal for failure to state a claim on 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) review. *See Pino v. Ryan*, 49 F.3d 51, 53-54 (2d Cir. 1995) (holding that a complaint can be dismissed on initial review based on a defense that appears on the face of the complaint); *Syfert v. City of Rome*, 17-CV-0578, 2018 WL 3121611, at *3-5 (N.D.N.Y. Feb. 12, 2018) (Dancks, M.J.) (dismissing all claims as barred by the statute of limitations on initial review pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)).

With regard to Plaintiff's allegations that Defendants Filli and Hurley “falsely arrested” him, the Court must determine when the claims accrued. The Second Circuit in *Singleton* found that a false arrest claim accrued on the date of arrest because that “was the time at which plaintiff knew of his injury arising from the alleged ... false arrest.” *Singleton v. City of New York*, 632 F.2d 185, 191 (2d Cir. 1980). Applying *Wallace v. Kato*, 549 U.S. 384 (2007), the Second Circuit more recently held that a false arrest claim accrues when the “false imprisonment ends,” or more specifically, “when ‘the victim becomes held pursuant to legal process,’ ” *e.g.,* when he is arraigned on charges. *Lynch v. Suffolk Cty. Police Dep't, Inc.*, 348 F. App'x 672, 675 (2d Cir. 2009) (quoting *Wallace*, 549 U.S. at 388-89); *see also Thomas v. Heid*, 17-CV-1213, 2017 WL 9673716, at *3 (N.D.N.Y. Dec. 6, 2017) (recognizing that a false arrest claim accrues under § 1983 is when “the alleged false imprisonment ends: when the arrestee is bound over by a magistrate or arraigned on charges.”) (Stewart, M.J.), *report and recommendation adopted*, 2018 WL 1773130 (N.D.N.Y.

Apr. 12, 2018) (D'Agostino, J.). Other cases have simply held that a false arrest claim under § 1983 accrues on the date of arrest itself. See *Kislowksi v. Kelley*, 19-CV-218, 2020 WL 495059, at *3 (N.D.N.Y. Jan. 30, 2020) (Stewart, M.J.) (“a false arrest claim accrues at the time of the arrest.”).

The distinction between the date of arrest and the date of arraignment here is of no moment because Plaintiff alleges that he was arrested and arraigned on the same day, April 18, 2017. (Dkt. No. 1 at 4.) Even if the charges stemming from the April 9, 2017, incident were ultimately dismissed on March 16, 2018, as Plaintiff alleges,⁹ his false arrest claims against Defendants Filli and Hurley first accrued on April 18, 2017, the date when he was both arrested and arraigned on those charges. As a result, the statute of limitations on his false arrest claims under § 1983 expired on or about April 18, 2020. The Complaint was signed on March 6, 2021 and filed with the Court on March 22, 2021, well after the three-year period had expired.¹⁰ I therefore recommend that Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment false arrest claims against Defendants Filli and Hurley be dismissed as untimely.

⁹ Significantly, it is no longer the law of this circuit that a “false arrest” claim under § 1983 accrues only once a plaintiff received a favorable judgment stemming from the allegedly false arrest. See *Jones v. City of New York*, 13-CV-929, 2016 WL 1322443, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2016) (explaining that the prior rule from *Covington v. City of New York*, 171 F.3d 117 (2d Cir. 1999) that a false arrest claim may not accrue until a favorable verdict was reached was overruled by the Supreme Court's *Wallace* decision).

¹⁰ Under the prison mailbox rule, a prisoner's complaint is deemed filed when it is handed to prison officials—presumptively on the date that the complaint was signed. *Hardy v. Conway*, 162 Fed. App'x 61, 62 (2d Cir. 2006) (collecting cases).

ii. *Miranda* Claim Against Defendant McCrindle

*8 As a general matter, “no cause of action exists under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for *Miranda* violations.” *Hernandez v. Llukaci*, 16-CV-1030, 2019 WL 1427429, at *7 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 29, 2019) (Hurd, J.) (citing *Chavez v. Martinez*, 538 U.S. 760, 767 (2003)). The failure to inform a plaintiff of his rights under *Miranda*, “does not, without more, result in §

1983 liability.” *Deshawn E. v. Safir*, 156 F.3d 340, 346 (2d Cir. 1998). Instead, the remedy for a violation of the right against self-incrimination is ‘the exclusion from evidence of any ensuing self-incriminating statements’ and ‘not a § 1983 action.’ ” *Id.* (quoting *Neighbour v. Covert*, 68 F.3d 1508, 1510 (2d Cir. 1995)). However, “[a] *Miranda* violation that amounts to actual coercion based on outrageous government misconduct is a deprivation of a constitutional right that can be the basis for a § 1983 suit, even when a confession is not used against the declaration in any fashion.” *Id.* at 348 (internal citations omitted).

The Complaint does not allege any facts that would plausibly suggest that Defendant McCrindle coerced Plaintiff into giving any inculpatory statements that were later used against him. Additionally, much like Plaintiff's claims alleging false arrest, Plaintiff's *Miranda* claim against Defendant McCrindle is untimely because it was not made within three years from the date that it accrued. See *Rahn v. Erie County Sheriff's Dept.*, 96-CV-0756E, 1999 WL 1067560, at *2 (W.D.N.Y. Nov. 19, 1999) (finding that a *Miranda* claim accrued “about the time of [plaintiff's] arrest” and was subject to the three year statute of limitations bar to § 1983 claims). For these reasons, I recommend Plaintiff's *Miranda* claim against Defendant McCrindle be dismissed.

iii. Fabrication of Evidence Claims Against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle

“When a police officer creates false information likely to influence a jury's decision and forwards that information to prosecutors, he violates the accused’ constitutional right to a fair trial, and the harm occasioned by such an unconscionable action is redressable in an action for damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.” *Ricciuti v. N.Y.C. Transit Auth.*, 124 F.3d 123, 130 (2d Cir. 1997) (citations omitted). Unlike Plaintiff's claims for false arrest and for a *Miranda* violation, “[t]he statute of limitations for a fabricated-evidence claim ... does not begin to run until the criminal proceedings against the defendant (i.e., the § 1983 plaintiff) have terminated in his favor.” *McDonough v. Smith*, 139 S. Ct. 2149, 2154–55 (2019).

Mindful of the Second Circuit's instruction that a *pro se* plaintiff's pleadings must be liberally construed and without expressing an opinion as to whether the Complaint can withstand a properly filed motion to dismiss or for summary judgment, I recommend that a response be required to Plaintiff's fabrication of evidence claims relating to the case

against Plaintiff in the City of Albany, against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle, in their individual capacities.

iv. Due Process Claims Against Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle

The Complaint makes several generalized references to being deprived of “due process” and his “life, liberty, and happiness” in connection with the claims against Defendants McCrindle, Filli, and Hurley. (Dkt. No. 1 at 6-7.) But where a plaintiff makes due process and false arrest claims stemming from the same set of facts, the Second Circuit has held that the two claims “merge,” such that a plaintiff’s due process claim is subsumed by the “false arrest” claim. *Fernandez-Bravo v. Town of Manchester*, 711 F. App’x 5, 8 (2d Cir. 2017); *Maliha v. Faluotico*, 286 F. App’x 742, 744 (2d Cir. 2008); see also *Lozado v. Weilminster*, 92 F. Supp. 3d 76, 102 (E.D.N.Y. 2015) (holding that a plaintiff’s procedural due process claim merges with his false arrest claim, the constitutional source of which is the Fourth Amendment); but see *Sepulveda v. City of New York*, 15-CV-5187, 2017 WL 3891808, at *5 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 14, 2017) (recognizing that a false arrest claim will not merge with a due process claim where the due process claim challenges the conditions of detention, as opposed to the wrongfulness of the detention itself), *report and recommendation adopted*, 15-CV-5187, 2017 WL 3887872 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 5, 2017).

*9 It is clear from the face of the Complaint that Plaintiff’s vague and conclusory references to being denied due process stem directly from the allegations relating to his false arrest.¹¹ I therefore find that any due process claims Plaintiff alleges against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle merge into his false arrest claims, and consistent with my prior analysis of those claims in Section V.D.1.i., I recommend that they are dismissed as untimely.

¹¹ Plaintiff also makes the conclusory allegation that he was “deprived of bail.” (Dkt. No. 1 at 7.) However, it is clear from the face of the Complaint that Plaintiff was afforded bail, as he alleges that when the April 9, 2017 incident took place, he was out on bail from prior charges. (*Id.* at 3.) Only after he was arrested and arraigned on charges stemming from that April 9, 2017 incident does he allege that his bail on the prior charges was revoked, “after [a] bail revocation hearing.” (*Id.* at 5.)

2. Official Capacity

“ ‘[C]laims against a government employee in his official capacity are treated as a claim against the municipality,’ and, thus, cannot stand under the Eleventh Amendment.” *Jackson v. Gunsalus*, 16-CV-0647, 2016 WL 4004612, at *2 (N.D.N.Y. June 24, 2016) (Dancks, M.J.) (quoting *Hines v. City of Albany*, 542 F. Supp. 2d 218, 227 (N.D.N.Y. 2008) (McCurn, J.)), *report and recommendation adopted by*, 2016 WL 3983635 (July 25, 2016) (Sharpe, J.); see *Hafer v. Melo*, 502 U.S. 21, 25 (1991) (citing *Graham*, 473 U.S. at 166-67) (“Suits against state officials in their official capacity therefore should be treated as suits against the State.”).

Here, to the extent that Plaintiff asserts claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle in their official capacities, I recommend that those claims be dismissed because they are, in reality, claims against the State of New York, which is immune from suit.

VI. OPPORTUNITY TO AMEND

Generally, a court should not dismiss claims contained in a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant without granting leave to amend at least once “when a liberal reading of the complaint gives any indication that a valid claim might be stated.” *Branum v. Clark*, 927 F.2d 698, 704-05 (2d Cir. 1991); see also *Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2)* (“The court should freely give leave when justice so requires.”). An opportunity to amend is not required, however, where “the problem with [the plaintiff’s] causes of action is substantive” such that “better pleading will not cure it.” *Cuoco v. Moritsugu*, 222 F.3d 99, 112 (2d Cir. 2000); see also *Cortec Indus. Inc. v. Sum Holding L.P.*, 949 F.2d 42, 48 (2d Cir. 1991) (“Of course, where a plaintiff is unable to allege any fact sufficient to support its claim, a complaint should be dismissed with prejudice.”). Stated differently, “[w]here it appears that granting leave to amend is unlikely to be productive, ... it is not an abuse of discretion to deny leave to amend.” *Ruffolo v. Oppenheimer & Co.*, 987 F.2d 129, 131 (2d Cir. 1993); accord, *Brown v. Peters*, 95-CV-1641, 1997 WL 599355, at *1 (N.D.N.Y. Sept. 22, 1997) (Pooler, J.).¹²

¹² See also *Carris v. First Student, Inc.*, 132 F. Supp. 3d 321, 340-41 n.1 (N.D.N.Y. 2015) (Suddaby, C.J.) (explaining that the standard set forth in *Gomez v. USAA Fed. Sav. Bank*, 171 F.3d 794, 796 (2d Cir. 1999)—that the Court should grant

leave to amend “unless the court can rule out any possibility, however unlikely it might be, that an amended complaint would be successful in stating a claim”—is likely not an accurate recitation of the governing law after *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)), *rev'd on other grounds*, 682 F. App'x 30.

*10 I recommend that Plaintiff's claims against Defendant State of New York be dismissed with prejudice and without leave to amend. *Sonnick v. Budlong*, 20-CV-0410, 2020 WL 2999109, at *10 (N.D.N.Y. June 4, 2020) (Lovric, M.J.) (recommending dismissal without leave to amend, claims against New York State Police), *report and recommendation adopted by*, 2020 WL 4345004 (N.D.N.Y. July 29, 2020) (McAvoy, J.). Similarly, I recommend that Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle, in their official capacities, be dismissed with prejudice and without leave to amend because they are immune from suit. *See Jackson v. Gunsalus*, 16-CV-0647, 2016 WL 4004612, at *2 (N.D.N.Y. June 24, 2016) (Dancks, M.J.) (dismissing with prejudice and without leave to amend claims against police officers, in their official capacities, as barred by the Eleventh Amendment), *report and recommendation adopted*, 2016 WL 3983635 (July 25, 2016) (Sharpe, J.). I also recommend that Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Soares and Sharp, in their official and individual capacities, be dismissed with prejudice and without leave to amend because they are also immune from suit. *See Lawrence v. Sherman*, 20-CV-0694, 2020 WL 5904789, at *3 (N.D.N.Y. Oct. 6, 2020) (D'Agostino, J.) (dismissing with prejudice claims against a defendant prosecutor based on the doctrine of prosecutorial immunity).

I also recommend dismissal with leave to amend the fabrication of evidence claims, that relate to the case against Plaintiff in the Town of Guilderland, against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle, in their individual capacities.¹³ *Perry v. City of Albany*, 20-CV-165, 2020 WL 3405636, at *4 (N.D.N.Y. May 6, 2020) (Stewart, M.J.) (recommending dismissal with leave to amend claims that appeared to be barred based on *Heck*), *report and recommendation adopted*, 20-CV-0165, 2020 WL 3403080 (N.D.N.Y. June 19, 2020) (Suddaby, C.J.).

¹³ As discussed in Section V.D.1.iii. above, I recommend that the fabrication of evidence claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle, in their individual capacities, that relate to the case

against Plaintiff in the City of Albany be accepted for filing because Plaintiff specifically alleged that the City of Albany case was terminated in Plaintiff's favor. (Dkt. No. 1 at 5.)

As to Plaintiff's claims for false arrest against Defendants Filli and Hurley, in their individual capacities, and for a *Miranda* violation against Defendant McCrindle, in his individual capacity, although I have found that these claims are barred by the applicable statute of limitations for the reasons stated in Sections V.D.1.i. and V.D.1.ii., a district court typically should not dismiss claims as time-barred without providing a *pro se* plaintiff with “notice and an opportunity to be heard” as to whether there might be a meritorious tolling argument or other reason why the complaint might be considered. *Abbas v. Dixon*, 480 F.3d 636, 640 (2d Cir. 2007). For that reason, I recommend that Plaintiff's false arrest and *Miranda* claims be dismissed with leave to amend, even though it appears very unlikely to the undersigned that Plaintiff can state plausible claims.

If Plaintiff chooses to file an amended complaint, he should note that the law in this circuit clearly provides that “ ‘complaints relying on the civil rights statutes are insufficient unless they contain some specific allegations of fact indicating a deprivation of rights, instead of a litany of general conclusions that shock but have no meaning.’ ” *Hunt v. Budd*, 895 F. Supp. 35, 38 (N.D.N.Y. 1995) (McAvoy, J.) (quoting *Barr v. Abrams*, 810 F.2d 358, 363 (2d Cir. 1987)); *accord Pourzancavakil v. Humphry*, 94-CV-1594, 1995 WL 316935, at *7 (N.D.N.Y. May 23, 1995) (Pooler, J.). In any amended complaint, Plaintiff must clearly set forth facts that give rise to the claims, including the dates, times, and places of the alleged underlying acts, and each individual who committed each alleged wrongful act. The revised pleading must also allege facts demonstrating the specific involvement of any of the named defendants in the constitutional deprivations alleged in sufficient detail to establish that they were tangibly connected to those deprivations. *Bass v. Jackson*, 790 F.2d 260, 263 (2d Cir. 1986). Finally, Plaintiff is informed that any such amended complaint will replace the existing Complaint and must be a wholly integrated and complete pleading that does not rely upon or incorporate by reference any pleading or document previously filed with the Court. *See Shields v. Citytrust Bancorp, Inc.*, 25 F.3d 1124, 1128 (2d Cir. 1994) (“It is well established that an amended complaint ordinarily supersedes the original and renders it of no legal effect.”).

*11 ACCORDINGLY, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff's amended *in forma pauperis* application (Dkt. No. 5) is **GRANTED**; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court (1) provide the Superintendent of the facility that Plaintiff has designated as his current location with a copy of Plaintiff's inmate authorization form (Dkt. No. 3) and notify that official that Plaintiff has filed this action and is required to pay the Northern District of New York the entire statutory filing fee of \$350.00 in installments, over time, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915; and (2) provide a copy of Plaintiff's inmate authorization form (Dkt. No. 3) to the Financial Deputy of the Clerk's Office; and it is further respectfully

RECOMMENDED that the Court **ACCEPT FOR FILING** Plaintiff's fabrication of evidence claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle, in their individual capacities, as those claims relate to the case against Plaintiff in the City of Albany; and it is further respectfully

RECOMMENDED that the Court **DISMISS WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND WITH LEAVE TO REPLEAD** Plaintiff's fabrication of evidence claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle, in their individual capacities, as those claims relate to the case against Plaintiff in the Town of Guilderland, as premature pursuant to *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994); and it is further respectfully

RECOMMENDED that the Court **DISMISS WITH PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT LEAVE TO REPLEAD** Plaintiff's claims against the State of New York, Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle, in their official capacities, and Defendants Sharp and Soares, in their official and individual capacities; and it is further respectfully

RECOMMENDED that the Court **DISMISS WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND WITH LEAVE TO REPLEAD**

Plaintiff's false arrest claims against Defendants Filli and Hurley, in their individual capacities, and Plaintiff's claim for a *Miranda* violation against Defendant McCrindle, in his individual capacity; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall file a copy of this Order and Report-Recommendation on Plaintiff, along with copies of the unpublished decisions cited herein in accordance with the Second Circuit's decision in *Lebron v. Sanders*, 557 F.3d 76 (2d Cir. 2009) (per curiam).

NOTICE: Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties have fourteen days within which to file written objections to the foregoing report.¹⁴ Such objections shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court. **FAILURE TO OBJECT TO THIS REPORT WITHIN FOURTEEN DAYS WILL PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (Supp. 2013); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), 6(d), 72; *Roldan v. Racette*, 984 F.2d 85 (2d Cir. 1993) (citing *Small v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs.*, 892 F.2d 15 (2d Cir. 1989)).

¹⁴ If you are proceeding *pro se* and served with this report, recommendation, and order by mail, three additional days will be added to the fourteen-day period, meaning that you have seventeen days from the date that the report, recommendation, and order was mailed to you to serve and file objections. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d). If the last day of that prescribed period falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, then the deadline is extended until the end of the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1)(C).

All Citations

Slip Copy, 2021 WL 3037709

2021 WL 3032691

2021 WL 3032691

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, N.D. New York.

Rondue GENTRY, Plaintiff,

v.

State of NEW YORK; Kyle Filli; David Hurley; Heath McCrindle; Steven Sharp; and David Soares, Defendants.

1:21-CV-0319 (GTS/ML)

1

Signed 07/19/2021

Attorneys and Law Firms

RONDUE GENTRY, 18-A-1238, Plaintiff, Pro Se, Lakeview Shock Incarceration Correctional Facility, P.O. Box T, Brocton, New York 14716.

DECISION and ORDER

GLENN T. SUDDABY, Chief United States District Judge

*1 Currently before the Court, in this *pro se* civil rights action filed by Rondue Gentry ("Plaintiff") against the State of New York, New York State Police Officers Kyle Filli, David Hurley and Heath McCrindle, Assistant District Attorney Steven Sharp, and Albany County District Attorney David Soares ("Defendants"), is United States Magistrate Judge Miroslav Lovric's Report-Recommendation recommending that certain of Plaintiff's claims be dismissed with prejudice (and without prior leave to amend), certain of those claims be dismissed without prejudice (and with limited leave to amend in this action), and the remainder of those claims survive the Court's *sua sponte* review of his Complaint. (Dkt. No. 7.) Plaintiff has not filed an Objection to the Report-Recommendation, and the deadline by which to do so has expired. (*See generally* Docket Sheet.)

After carefully reviewing the relevant papers herein, including Magistrate Judge Lovric's thorough Report-Recommendation, the Court can find no clear error in the Report-Recommendation.¹ Magistrate Judge Lovric employed the proper standards, accurately recited the facts, and reasonably applied the law to those facts. As a result, the Report-Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety for the reasons set forth therein.

1

When no objection is made to a report-recommendation, the Court subjects that report-recommendation to only a clear-error review. *Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)*, Advisory Committee Notes: 1983 Addition. When performing such a clear-error review, "the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Id.*; *see also Batista v. Walker*, 94-CV-2826, 1995 WL 453299, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 31, 1995) (Sotomayor, J.) ("I am permitted to adopt those sections of [a magistrate judge's] report to which no specific objection is made, so long as those sections are not facially erroneous.") (internal quotation marks omitted).

ACCORDINGLY, it is

ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Lovric's Report-Recommendation (Dkt. No.7) is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** in its entirety; and it is further

ORDERED that the following claims are **DISMISSED with prejudice** and **without prior leave to amend**: (1) Plaintiff's claims against the State of New York; (2) Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley, and McCrindle in their official capacities; and (3) Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Sharp and Soares in their official and individual capacities; and it is further

ORDERED that the following claims are **DISMISSED without prejudice** to repleading during the pendency of this action and **with leave to amend** within **THIRTY (30) DAYS** of the date of this Decision and Order: (1) Plaintiff's fabrication-of-evidence claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley and McCrindle in their individual capacities to the extent that those claims relate to the case against Plaintiff in the Town of Guilderland; (2) Plaintiff's false arrest claims against Defendants Filli and Hurley in their individual capacities; (3) Plaintiff's claim for a *Miranda* violation against Defendant McCrindle in his individual capacity; and it is further

*2 **ORDERED** that **SURVIVING** this Decision and Order are Plaintiff's fabrication-of-evidence claims against Defendants Filli, Hurley and McCrindle in their individual capacities to the extent that those claims relate to the case against Plaintiff in the City of Albany; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is directed to issue Summonses and forward, along with copies of the Complaint,

to the U.S. Marshal for service upon Defendants Filli, Hurley and McCrindle, and those Defendants are directed to respond in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

All Citations

Slip Copy, 2021 WL 3032691

End of Document

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.